

LONDON
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

CHICAGO. THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
(AGENTS FOR THE UNITED STATES)
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS: MACMILLAN
TOKYO: MARUZEN COMPANY LTD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

CHARLES J. SISSON
WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

AND

H. G. ATKINS

VOLUME XXXII



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1937

CONTENTS

ARTICLES	PAGE
ATKINSON, WILLIAM C., The Chronology of Spanish Ballad Origins	44
BALD, R. C., The Chronology of Middleton's Plays	33
BARKER, ARTHUR, Milton's Schoolmasters	317
COTTON, J. M. S., <i>Ex Libris Politiani</i> , II	394
DEAN, RUTH J., Manuscripts of St Elizabeth of Schonau in England	62
ENGLAND, SYLVIA L., Some Unpublished French Political Poems of the Sixteenth Century	400
GILLIES, A., Herder's Essay on Shakespeare: 'Das Herz der Untersuchung'	262
GORDON, E. V., The Date of Æthelred's Treaty with the Vikings: Olaf Trygvason and the Battle of Maldon	24
GREEN, F. C., Medieval and Modern Sensibility	553
JENKINS, HAROLD, A Poet in Chancery: Edward Benlowes	382
KASTNER, L. E., Notes on the Poems of Bertran de Born, V	169
LEVINGER, HELENE, A Sixteenth-Century Judith-Drama	371
MAINLAND, W. F., Some Notes on German Drama as National Commentary in the Seventeenth Century	408
NORMAN, F., 'Door': A Criticism and an Interpretation	374
PYLE, FITZROY, 'The Barbarous Metre of Barclay'	353
SERJEANTSON, MARY S., The Index of the Vernon Manuscript	222
THOMAS, R. H., Notes on some Unpublished Papers of Reinhard Johannes Sorge: A Contribution relating to the Genesis of Expressionism	123
WAGENBLASS, JOHN HENRY, Kents and Lucretius	537
WAGNER, ALBERT MALTE, H. W. von Gerstenberg and German Literature in the Eighteenth Century	72
WEEVERS, TH., Vondel's Influence on German Literature	1
MISCELLANEOUS NOTES	
BECKINGHAM, C. F., Seneca's Fatalism and Elizabethan Tragedy	434
BROOKS, BENJ. GILBERT, Wordsworth and the Horatian Spirit	588
COLGRAVE, B., 'Scûrheard'	281
COLGRAVE, B., Some Notes on Riddle 21	281
DAS, S. K., A Note on 'Crist', Line 20	79
DRAPER, JOHN W., 'My Switzers'	585
EDWARDS, H. L. R., Robert Gaguin and the English Poets, 1489-90	430
JONES, CLAUDE, The 'Second Nun's Tale', a Mediæval Sermon	283
KENNEDY, RUTH LEE, 'Los Engaños de un Engaño y Confusión de un Papel', A Play by Don Rodrigo Herrera y Ribera	503
LAMSON, ROY, JR., Some Elizabethan Tunes	584
MENON, C. NARAYANA, A Stage Direction in the New Shakespeare 'Hamlet'	438
PERRY, L. M., 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight', Line 2511	80
STANSFIELD, A., 'Deutsche Klassik und Romantik'	445
STIRK, S. D., A Note on Gerhart Hauptmann's 'Hamlet in Wittenberg'	595
TUTTLE, EDWIN H., French 'œil'	83
VINCENT, E. R., An Attack on Foscolo	441
WELTMAN, J., A Letter of Novalis	283
WILLIAMS, FRANKLIN B., JR., An Unrecognized Edition of Nicholas Breton	81
REVIEWS	
Acolastus, The Comedy of, trans. by J. Palsgrave, ed. by P. L. Carver (W. W. GREG)	601
Aikin-Sneath, B., Comedy in Germany in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century (H. G. ATKINS)	657

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Ainsworth, E. G., Jr., Poor Collins (G. TILLOTSON)	616
Alonso, D., Poesía Española, Antología, I (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	116
Alonso, D., La Lengua poética de Góngora, I (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	116
Anstensen, A., The Proverb in Ibsen (E. PURDIE)	131
Arbor of Amorous Devices 1597, ed. by H. E. Rollins (K. TILLOTSON)	609
Babbitt, T., La Crónica de Veinte Reyes (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	639
Baker, E. A., The History of the English Novel, VII (R. D. WALLER)	301
Balet, L., and E. Gerhard, Die Verbürgerlichung der deutschen Kunst, Literatur und Musik im 18. Jahrhundert (W. H. BRUFORD)	327
Barnard, E., Shelley's Religion (R. D. WALLER)	622
Beattie, L. M., John Arbuthnot (J. R. SUTHERLAND)	458
Beddoes, T. L., The Browning Box, ed. by H. W. Donner (E. C. BATHO)	303
Beddoes, T. L., Works, ed. by H. W. Donner (E. C. BATHO)	303
Bede: his Life, Times and Writings, ed. by A. Hamilton Thompson (J. H. LE PATOUREL)	449
Bense, J. F., A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary (O. K. SCHRAM)	123
Besthorn, R., Ursprung und Eigenart der alteren italienischen Novelle (C. S. GUTKIND)	313
Blenkinsop, E. S., Burger's Originality (D. YATES)	656
Borgman, A. S., William Mountfort (V. DE S. PINTO)	98
Bottiglioni, G., Atlante Linguistico Etnografico Italiano della Corsica (A. EWERT)	471
Boyd, J., Ulrich Fietrer's Parzival (M. F. RICHEY)	323
Buck, A., Der Platonismus in den Dichtungen Lorenzo de' Medici (C. FOLIGNO)	473
Bunje, E. T. H., A Reinterpretation of the Expository Verses of the Hildebrandslied (W. PERRETT)	479
Busnelli, G., and G. Vandelli, Il Convivio ridotto a miglior lezione e commentato (C. FOLIGNO)	636
Carols, The Early English, ed. by R. L. Greene (B. PATTISON)	453
Castelli, A., La Gerusalemme Liberata nella Inghilterra di Spenser (R. D. WALLER)	293
Castro, A., Glosarios latino-españoles de la Edad Media (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	471
Christi Leiden, ed. by R. Priebsch (F. P. PICKERING)	127
Cidade, H., Luís de Camões, i: o lírico (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	477
Coe, Ada M., Catálogo Bibliográfico y Crítico de las Comedias Anunciadas en los Periódicos de Madrid desde 1661 hasta 1819 (W. C. ATKINSON)	315
Coleridge, Hartley, Letters, ed. by G. E. and E. L. Griggs (A. L. STROUT)	621
Coleridge, S. T., Miscellaneous Criticism, ed. by T. M. Raysor (R. C. BALD)	619
Comedies, Representative English, ed. by C. M. Gayley and A. Thaler, IV (V. DE S. PINTO)	612
Craig, H., The Enchanted Glass (B. E. C. DAVIS)	90
Crews, C. M., Recherches sur le judéo-espagnol dans les pays balkaniques (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	120
Deane, C. V., Aspects of Eighteenth-Century Nature Poetry (J. R. SUTHERLAND)	460
Donner, H. W., Thomas Lovell Beddoes (E. C. BATHO)	303
Du Bartas, Works, ed. by U. T. Holmes, Jr., J. C. Lyons, and R. W. Linker, I: The Life of Du Bartas (F. J. TANQUERAY)	108
Duméril, E., Le Lied allemand et ses traductions poétiques en France; Lieds et Ballades germaniques traduits en vers français (K. W. MAURER)	486
Durling, D. L., Georgic Tradition in English Poetry (W. D. THOMAS)	298
Eastwood, D. M., The Revival of Pascal (N. J. ABERCROMBIE)	309
Eaton, H. A., Thomas De Quincey (J. W. H. ATKINS)	461
Elwert, W. T., Geschichtsauffassung und Erzählungstechnik in den historischen Romanen F. D. Guerrazzis (E. R. VINCENT)	119

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Exeter Book, The, ed. by G. P. Krapp and E. V. K. Dobbie (W. J. SEDGE-FIELD)	451
Faguet, E., <i>Histoire de la Poésie Française</i> , X (H. BIBAS)	634
Ferretti, G., <i>I due Tempi della Composizione della Divina Commedia</i> (C. FOLIGNO)	114
Firkins, O. W., <i>Power and Elusiveness in Shelley</i> (R. D. WALLER)	622
Florio's <i>First Frutes</i> , ed. by A. del Re (G. D. WILLCOCK)	607
Góngora, <i>Las Soledades</i> , ed. by D. Alonso (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	116
Grabo, C., <i>The Magic Plant</i> (R. D. WALLER)	622
Gray, T., <i>Correspondence</i> , ed. by P. Toynbee and L. Whibley (J. BUTT)	101
Greatwood, E. A., <i>Die dichterische Selbstdarstellung im Roman des Jungen Deutschland</i> (E. M. BUTLER)	128
Grober, G., <i>Geschichte der Mittelfranzösischen Literatur</i> , II (T. WALTON)	627
Guichard, L., <i>L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard; L'interprétation graphique, cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de Jules Renard</i> (F. C. ROE)	467
Hankamer, P., <i>Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock</i> (W. F. MAINLAND)	326
Hathaway, L. V., <i>German Literature of the Mid-Nineteenth Century in England and America</i> (H. G. ATKINS)	132
Hilles, F. W., <i>The Literary Career of Sir Joshua Reynolds</i> (G. KITCHIN)	299
Hillhouse, J., <i>The Waverley Novels and their Critics</i> (W. L. RENWICK)	617
Hofstrand, G., <i>The Seege of Troye</i> (H. A. C. GREEN)	452
Hort, G., <i>Sense and Thought</i> (H. C. WHITE)	600
Hoskins, J., <i>Directions for Speech and Style</i> , ed. by H. H. Hudson (G. D. WILLCOCK)	291
Hudson, N. E., <i>Ultra-Royalism and the French Restoration</i> (H. J. HUNT)	633
Hunt, H. J., <i>Le Socialisme et le Romantisme en France</i> (M. E. I. ROBERTSON)	113
Idley, Peter, <i>Instructions to his Son</i> , ed. by C. D'Evelyn (G. D. WILLCOCK)	86
Jörder, O., <i>Die Formen des Sonetts bei Lope de Vega</i> (W. C. ATKINSON)	476
Kellermann, W., <i>Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Perceval-roman</i> (C. I. WILSON)	628
Kennedy, C. W., <i>Old English Elegies</i> (E. BLACKMAN)	599
Kirk, R., <i>Mr Pepys Upon the State of Christ-Hospital</i> (G. KITCHIN)	457
Knyghthode and Bataille, ed. by R. Dyboski and Z. M. Arend (J. P. OAKDEN)	84
Laborde, E. D., <i>Byrhtnoth and Maldon</i> (R. M. WILSON)	450
Lancaster, H. C., <i>A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century</i> , III (W. G. MOORE)	306
Lansel, P., <i>The Raeto-Romans</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	645
Lehmgrubner, W., <i>Die Erweckung der Walküre</i> (K. C. KING)	126
Levin, L. M., <i>The Political Doctrine of Montesquieu's 'Esprit des Lois'</i> (F. T. H. FLETCHER)	629
Lewis, C. S., <i>The Allegory of Love</i> (G. L. BROOK)	287
Lieftinck, G. I., <i>De Middelnederlandsche Taulerhandschriften</i> (TH. WEEVERS)	648
Linthicum, M. C., <i>Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries</i> (G. B. HARRISON)	456
Lipari, A., <i>The Dolce Stil Novo according to Lorenzo de' Medici</i> (C. FOLIGNO)	473
Liptzin, S., <i>Richard Beer-Hofmann</i> (W. ROSE)	328
<i>Livros Antigos Portuguezes, 1489-1600, da Bibliotheca de Sua Majestade Fidelissima</i> , vol. III and Supplement (A. F. G. BELL)	121
Lohmann, O., <i>Die Rahmenerzahlung des Decameron</i> (C. S. GUTKIND)	313
Lope de Vega Carpio, <i>Autógrafos</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	641
Lucas, F. L., <i>The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal</i> (C. J. SISSON)	300
Lydgate's <i>Troy Book</i> , ed. by H. Bergen, IV (J. P. OAKDEN)	84
Lyman, D. B., <i>The Great Tom Fuller</i> (G. KITCHIN)	96
Macalister, R. A. S., <i>The Secret Languages of Ireland</i> (K. JACKSON)	598
McClelland, I. L., <i>The Origins of the Romantic Movement in Spain</i> (R. HILTON)	643

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Magnon, J., <i>Tite</i> , ed. by H. Bell (H. BIBAS)	110
Marni, A., <i>Allegory in the French Heroic Poem of the Seventeenth Century</i> (F. J. TANQUEREY)	466
Milton, J., <i>Works</i> , Columbia edition, XI (B. A. WRIGHT)	96
Minder, R., <i>Un Poète Romantique Allemand: Ludwig Tieck</i> (E. PURDIE)	654
Moore, A. P., <i>The 'genre poissard' and the French Stage of the eighteenth century</i> (F. C. GREEN)	111
Mum and Sothsegger, ed. by M. Day and R. Steele (J. P. OAKDEN)	84
Notker der Deutsche, <i>Werke</i> , ed. by E. H. Seht and T. Staik, 2 (F. NORMAN)	652
Noyes, R. G., <i>Ben Jonson on the English Stage, 1660-1776</i> (F. E. BUDD)	297
Nunes, L., <i>Crónica de Dom João de Castro</i> , ed. by J. D. M. Ford (W. J. ENTWISTLE)	316
Ogilvy, J. D. A., <i>Books known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin</i> (F. J. E. RABY)	464
Osgood, C. G., <i>The Voice of England</i> (O. ELTON)	107
Paul, H., <i>Deutsches Wörterbuch</i> , ed. by K. Euling (F. NORMAN)	481
Pennink, R., <i>Nederland en Shakespeare</i> (B. W. DOWNS)	610
Pfund, H. W., <i>Studien zu Wort und Stil bei Brockes</i> (W. F. MAINLAND)	482
Pribsch, R., <i>Letter from Heaven on the Observance of the Lord's Day</i> (N. H. BAYNES)	649
Puttenham, G., <i>The Arte of English Poesie</i> , ed. by G. D. Willcock and A. Walker (G. BULLOUGH)	605
Raith, J., <i>Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters Palace of Pleasure</i> (H. G. WRIGHT)	288
Rasch, W., <i>Freundschaftskult und Freundschaftsdichtung im deutschen Schrifttum des 18. Jahrhunderts</i> (W. H. BRUFORD)	484
Rivaille, L., <i>Les Débuts de P. Corneille</i> (W. G. MOORE)	306
Robert of Clari, <i>The Conquest of Constantinople</i> , trans. by E. H. McNeal (F. H. MARSHALL)	305
Robertson, S., <i>The Development of Modern English</i> (R. HUCHON)	462
Roedder, E., <i>Volkssprache und Wortschatz des Badischen Frankenlandes</i> (F. P. PICKERING)	646
Sackville, T., <i>The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham</i> , ed. by Marguerite Hearsey (G. D. WILLCOCK)	289
Sale, W. M., Jr., <i>Samuel Richardson: a Bibliographical Record of his Literary Career with Historical Notes</i> (E. A. BAKER)	614
Schalk, F., <i>Einleitung in die Encyclopédie der französischen Aufklärung</i> (R. L. G. RICHIE)	631
Schmitt, L. E., <i>Die deutsche Urkundensprache in der Kanzlei Kaiser Karls IV</i> (J. M. CLARK)	322
Seaton, E., <i>Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century</i> (E. C. BATHO)	134
Shakespeare, W., <i>King John</i> , ed. by J. Dover Wilson (G. B. HARRISON)	455
Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 71, ed. by W. Keller and H. Hecht; 72, ed. by W. Keller (G. C. MOORE SMITH)	93, 609
Shoemaker, W. H., <i>The Multiple Stage in Spain during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries</i> (W. C. ATKINSON)	315
Siciliano, I., <i>Medio Evo e Rinascimento</i> (C. FOLIGNO)	115
Silver, M., <i>Jules Sandeau</i> (H. J. HUNT)	635
Sisson, C. J., <i>Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age</i> (G. C. MOORE SMITH)	94
Smith, C. G., <i>Spenser's Theory of Friendship</i> (W. L. RENWICK)	92
Smith, D. F., <i>Plays about the Theatre in England, 1671-1737</i> (F. E. BUDD)	613
Smith, W. G., and J. E. Heseltine, <i>The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs</i> (R. HUCHON)	286
<i>Speculum Sacerdotale</i> , ed. by E. H. Weatherly (J. P. OAKDEN)	84
Spencer, T., <i>Death and Elizabethan Tragedy</i> (J. H. WALTER)	294
Spenser, E., <i>Works</i> , Variorum edition, IV (W. L. RENWICK)	92
Sprague, A. C., <i>Shakespeare and the Audience</i> (G. B. HARRISON)	296

REVIEWS (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Stansbury, M. H., French Novelists of To-day (E. STARKIE)	469
Sterne, L., Letters, ed. by L. P. Curtis (G. KITCHIN)	99
Stumpff, R., Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung des mittelalterlichen Dramas (F. E. SANDBACH)	317
Teerink, H., A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift (E. A. BAKER)	614
Tenney, E. A., Thomas Lodge (G. BULLOUGH)	296
Tisserand, R., Au temps de l'Encyclopédie; Les concurrents de J.-J. Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon pour le prix de 1754 (E. EGGLI)	310
Turcotte, S. J., Les gens d'affaires sur la scène en France de 1870 à 1914 (F. C. ROE)	312
Van der Vat, D. G., The Fabulous Opera (R. D. WALLER)	625
Van der Veen, H. R. S., Jewish Characters in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction and Drama (F. E. BUDD)	103
Vanwelkenhuysen, G., J. K. Huysmans et la Belgique (E. STARKIE)	469
Vulgaria of John Stanbridge, The, and the Vulgaria of Robert Whittinton, ed. by B. White (M. S. SERJEANTSON)	88
Wendt, H., Max Dauthendey (R. SAMUEL)	487
Winters, Y., Primitivism and Decadence (E. DREW)	627
Wordsworth, W. and D., Early Letters, ed. by E. de Selincourt (C. M. MACLEAN)	104
Zeydel, E. H., Ludwig Tieck, the German Romanticist (A. GILLIES)	129
Zwirner, E. and K., Textliste neuhochdeutscher Vorlesesprache, schlesischer Farbung (D. B. FRY)	653

SHORT NOTICES

Abrahamson, E., Vastsvenska Ordstudier	338
Annals of English Literature, compiled by J. C. Ghosh and E. G. Withycombe	490
Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, XV, ed. by M. S. Serjeantson and L. N. Broughton	136
Apokalypse des 14. Jahrhunderts, Eine Deutsche, ed. by A. T. Hatto	336
Baesecke, A., Das Schauspiel der Englischen Komodianten in Deutschland	138
Bhattacharje, M. M., Platonic Ideas in Spenser	137
Bianquis, G., Histoire de la Littérature Allemande	494
Boas, F. S., From Richardson to Pinero	663
Borgese, G. A., On Dante Criticism	492
Braune, W., Althochdeutsche Grammatik, rev. by K. Helm	147
Bryson, F. R., The Point of Honor in Sixteenth-Century Italy	143
Buben, V., L'influence de l'orthographe sur la prononciation du français moderne	334
Buletinul Institutului de Filologie Română, ed. by I. Iordan	145
Carrillo de Sotomayor, L., Poesías Completas, ed. by D. Alonso	493
Child, H., The Shakespearian Productions of John Philip Kemble	137
Dach, S., Gedichte, ed. by W. Ziesemer	149
Dante-Jahrbuch, Deutsches, 17, 18.	142, 491
David, R., The Janus of Poets	660
de Filippis, M., Anecdotes in Manso's 'Vita di Tasso'	665
Dorrance, W. A., The Survival of French in the Old District of Sainte Genevieve	334
Doyle, H. G., A Bibliography of Rubén Darío	147
Doyle, H. G., A Tentative Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of the Republics of Central America	147
Elton, O., Style in Shakespeare	137
Essays and Studies, XXI, ed. by H. Read	330
Foligno, C., Edmund Garratt Gardner	136
Fransson, G., Middle English Surnames of Occupation	331
German Life and Letters, ed. by L. A. Willoughby	495
Girvan, R., Beowulf and the Seventh Century	330

SHORT NOTICES (<i>cont.</i>)	PAGE
Gislasaga, Aus der, ed. by K. Reichardt	149
Gordon, L. H., Supplementary Concordance to the Minor Italian Works of Dante	493
Gottschalk, W., Der Mensch im Sprichwort der romanischen Völker	494
Gottschalk, W., Die Natur im romanischen Sprichwort	144
Gray, T., and W. Collins, Poems, ed. by A. L. Poole, rev. by L. Whibley and F. Page	490
Green, F. C., Diderot's Writings on the Theatre	665
Gutenbrunner, S., Die germanischen Gotternamen der antiken Inschriften	667
Hammerich, L. L., Kortfattet Tysk Lydhistorie	339
Harrison, R., An Approach to French Poetry	141
Harvey, Sir P., Oxford Companion to English Literature	659
Hermansson, H., The Problem of Wineland	489
Heydet, X., Shaw-Kompendium	333
Hogan, C. B., A Bibliography of Edwin Arlington Robinson	662
Hollander, L. M., Old Norse Poems	150
Holzmann, A. W., Family Relationships in the Dramas of August von Kotzebue	337
Johnson, M. L., Beaumarchais and his Opponents	491
Johat, E., Smollett et la France	139
Keats, J., Letters, ed. by M. B. Forman	140
Kirschner, H., Beiträge zum Deutschen Volksliedstil um 1500	337
Korn, M. A., Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts	139
Kreider, P. V., Elizabethan Comic Character Conventions as revealed in the Comedies of George Chapman	489
Krüger, M., Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des Nonnenklosters Port-Royal im 17. Jahrhundert	664
Leavitt, S. E., Hispano-American Literature in the United States	147
Legge, J. G., Chanticleer	141
Lugnbühl, E., Die altdeutsche Kirchensprache	336
Macandrew, R. M., Translation from Spanish	147
Mackail, J. W., Andrew Cecil Bradley	136
Millardet, G., Le Roman de Flamenca	663
Nolte, F. O., The Early Middle Class Drama, 1696-1774	138
Ronte, H., Richardson und Fielding	662
Roos, C., Kleine deutsche Literaturgeschichte	668
Sargeant, W. D., Macbeth, a New Interpretation of the Text	661
Scheuermeier, P., Wasser- und Weingefässe im heutigen Italien	335
Schramm, E., Donoso Cortés	335
Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus, the first Quarto 1594, ed. by J. Q. Adams	660
Shaw, J. E., Dante and Bonagiunta	492
Smith, R. M., T. G. Ehrsam and R. H. Deily, Bibliographies of Twelve Victorian Authors	332
Smith-Dampier, J. L., Who's Who in Boswell?	140
Spee, F., Trutznachtigall, ed. by G. O. Arlt	494
Stirling, F., The Pronunciation of Spanish	146
Straumann, H., Newspaper Headlines	141
Tilgner, E., Die Aureate Terms als Stilelement bei Lydgate	658
Torres-Rioseco, A., y R. Silva-Castro, Ensayo de Bibliografía de la Literatura Chilena	147
Tortoreto, A., and J. G. Fucilla, Bibliografía analítica tassiana	666
Urefia, P. H., La Cultura y las letras coloniales en Santo Domingo	666
Vincent, E. R., The Commemoration of the Dead	143
Vox Romanica, ed. by J. Jud and A. Steiger	145
Wardale, W. L., Albrecht von Borgunnien's Treatise on Medicine	148
Watkins, W. B. C., Johnson and English Poetry before 1660	489
Williams, M., William Shenstone	661
Wilson, J. Dover, The Meaning of The Tempest	332
Wurtsbaugh, J., Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship (1609-1805)	331
Young, H. M., The Sonnets of Shakespeare, A Psycho-Sexual Analysis	659

VONDEL'S INFLUENCE ON GERMAN LITERATURE

EVER since the attention of scholars has been directed to the study of the so-called German Baroque the conviction has been growing that this movement entered North and Central Germany mainly from Holland—'das Zentrum aller nördlichen Barockkultur'.¹ It is therefore necessary to determine exactly the share which Vondel, the greatest of Dutch seventeenth-century poets, had in the making of this movement. His relation to the German Baroque is a somewhat complex one. Current German opinion regards him as the Baroque poet *par excellence*, but of late some Dutch scholars, notably Albert Verwey,² have opposed this view, by stressing the fact that Vondel is a late Renaissance author with certain Baroque characteristics, rather than the Rubens of literature, which some art historians have called him.

With regard to Vondel's influence in Germany, however, the issue is complicated by the fact that it was the Baroque qualities of his poetry that were admired and imitated by the German poets, as Paul Stachel³ and Willi Flemming⁴ have pointed out.

The influence of Holland on German literature starts with Opitz. It is well known that in his treatises *Das Buch von der deutschen Poeterey* and *Vorrede zu Seneca's Trojanerinnen* this poet followed Julius Scaliger's and still more Daniel Heinsius's interpretations of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Now Vondel's theory of the drama as it appears in the prefaces to his tragedies is likewise based on Aristotle as Heinsius and his successor Vossius understood him, though when it came to bringing the theory into practice, his poetic instinct often carried him beyond their teaching. As Opitz's treatises became the basis of all later theories of art in seventeenth-century Germany, one may say that his successors ultimately derived their ideas on the subject from the same source as Vondel, namely the Dutch scholars.

Besides these literary connexions there was the element of personal contact. Opitz had visited Holland in 1620, when he made the acquaintance of Heinsius. Such a journey to Holland, the so-called 'Kavalierstour', soon came to be regarded in Germany as an indispens-

¹ H. Cysarz, *Deutsche Barockdichtung*, p. 61.

² Lately in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, xxx (1936), pp. 31-4.

³ In 'Seneca und das Deutsche Renaissancedrama' (*Palaestra*, XLVI, Berlin, 1907).

⁴ In *A. Gryphius und die Bühne* (Halle, 1921).

able part of a liberal education. The poet Johann Rist went so far as to write:

Drumb wiltu dass dir sey Pracht Lust und Kunst bekannt,
So rath' ich, ziehe bald ins edle Niederland.

In order to understand his enthusiasm one need only remember the contrast between Germany and Holland during the Thirty Years' War and immediately after. It is true that until 1648 Holland was still at war with Spain, but this war was waged on foreign territory. At home a flourishing overseas trade was enriching the country year by year, and the chief towns, Amsterdam especially, had been changed out of all recognition by the many sumptuous houses which wealthy merchants had built for themselves. The Germans who visited Holland must have felt as if they were entering a land of promise.

Mostly they came to read law, medicine or one of the arts in the University of Leiden. Philipp von Zesen, a poet who had an important share in the spreading of the Baroque movement over Germany, graduated there, and then intermittently lived at Hamburg, and at Amsterdam where he gathered the material for his *Beschreibung der Stadt Amsterdam*, published in 1664. At Leiden, too, Paul Fleming was made Doctor of Medicine.

But from the point of view of general culture Amsterdam must have been the greater attraction. It was perhaps the chief centre of Europe for finance and commerce, as well as for the international book trade: the firm of Elzevir's was established there, which published not only Dutch books, but, even more, English, French, German and of course Latin works. Many well-known painters of the Dutch school lived there. In 1640 Rembrandt, to mention only the greatest of them, had already achieved fame, and his paintings fetched high prices. It was in Amsterdam, too, that the first Dutch theatre was opened in 1638, and it was inaugurated with a drama by Vondel, who by then was generally recognized as Holland's greatest poet. The play, *Gysbreght van Aemstel*, made a great impression on a young German who in the same year matriculated at Leiden: Andreas Gryphius.

Vondel's development as a poet had been a slow and gradual one. It was not until his thirtieth year that the first mature works were written, and from then until he reached the age of sixty-six, when his greatest tragedy *Lucifer* appeared, he steadily grew in poetic power. The following fourteen years saw the publication of its sequel *Adam in Ballingschap*, and of ten other tragedies, mostly of great beauty. In 1679 he died, ninety-three years old.

Vondel is essentially a Christian poet, but at the same time he was steeped in classical learning. He took a passionate interest in the political and religious life, not only of his own country, but of Europe also, witness his satires, his salutations of royal personages, and many other 'Gelegenhetsgedichte'. For nearly fifty years he was the spokesman of the United Provinces, and at times their national conscience.¹ Yet through his Roman Catholic faith (he was converted to Rome in 1641) and his symbolic interpretation of Biblical history, in fact of history in general, he was at variance with the realistic view which Calvinism takes of the Bible.² Especially after he had become a convert to Roman Catholicism, Vondel was an isolated figure, revered by a small circle of poets and lovers of art, generally respected as a public character, and abused by his enemies, the Calvinist divines.

There is the same apparent contradiction in the character of his poetry. It is alive with a great zest for life and an interest in all human activities, yet along with this there is the certainty that the world is but a short-lived vanity compared with the glory of God: Vondel's devotional poetry is inspired by his constant longing for eternal peace.

When Vondel was growing up in art, he read and studied the French poet Du Bartas. His first drama: *Het Pascha ofte de verlossinge Israels uit Egijpten* (1612), owes much to him and to a lesser degree to Ronsard.³ With the two tragedies that followed: *Hierusalem Verwoest* (1620) and *Palamedes* (1625), we see Vondel under the influence of Seneca, whose *Troades* and *Hippolytus* he translated. *Palamedes* must have appealed to Gryphius. Ostensibly a dramatization of the story of Palamedes, one of the Greek princes who during the siege of Troy had ventured to oppose Agamemnon, and was therefore condemned to death and stoned, it is in reality a political satire on the trial and execution of Oldenbarneveldt, the Grand Pensionary of Holland, in 1618.

All these plays, with the exception of *Hierusalem Verwoest*, were rejected by Vondel himself, when he was preparing the first edition of his collected works. *Gysbreght van Aemstel* was his first mature tragedy.

¹ A. Verwey, *Vondel's Vers* (Santpoort, 1927), p. 36.

² Two authoritative works on Vondel's ideas and his religion, one from the Protestant, the other from the Roman Catholic point of view, which thereby correct and supplement each other, are: J. Koopmans, *Vondel als Christen-Symbolist* (Versluys, Amsterdam, 1906), and G. Brom, *Vondel's Geloof* (N.V. de Spieghel, Amsterdam; Het Kompas, Mechelen, 1935).

³ See A. Beekman, *Influence de Du Bartas sur la littérature néerlandaise*, p. 56 (Poitiers, 1912), and also A. Hendriks, *J. v. d. Vondel en G. de Saluste Seigneur Du Bartas* (Leiden, 1892), and for Ronsard's influence: A. Verwey, *Vondel en Ronsard* (Vondel-Kroniek, v (1934), no. 4, pp. 152-3).

He had outgrown Seneca by this time. Later on he was to square accounts with the Latin dramatist:

Seneca's plays are replete with learning, but, strained beyond their power, they try with loud crying and stamping to deafen the Greeks, who all the time retain their natural tone, and, like expert musicians, know how to modulate their voice, in the cadence required, according to the purport of the words, and will therefore be deemed worthy of the first prize by the wisest arbitrators of Parnassus.¹

From then on Sophocles and Euripides were to be his masters in dramatic technique. But in *Gysbreght van Aemstel* his study of Virgil's *Aeneis* resulted in a happy blend of that poet's style and subject with Dutch poetry and history. Gysbreght, Lord of Amsterdam during an obscure siege and destruction of the town that had occurred in the fourteenth century, is Aeneas, and his blazing Amsterdam portrays the fire of Troy. Like Aeneas he is an exile, a hero greater in suffering than in action, almost a martyr. At the same time he is a national character, a representative of the many who in the war against Spain had preferred to fly across the frontier, rather than give up their faith.

In the same way the style, while frankly assimilating Virgil's similes and his phrasing, is entirely personal: the majestic yet flexible verse makes it Vondel's own. He has left behind the rhetoric of his Senecan period: the style has become simple and dignified. The story—in all essentials the same as that in *Aeneis*, II—is familiar enough. Its setting is Amsterdam, a medieval Roman Catholic city. Vondel lent to the drama a new *motif* of great dramatic effect: in accordance with the medieval chronicle the surprise and sack of the town takes place on Christmas Eve. Thereby he achieved a striking contrast between the celebration of the miracle of Bethlehem and the noise of war that breaks in upon it.²

This contrast must have impressed Gryphius, who was nothing if not a deviser of stage effects. In his first original drama, *Leo Armenius* (1646), he dramatized one of the many palace revolutions in the history of the Byzantine empire, which, according to the chroniclers, had also taken place on Christmas Eve. It had been staged before by the Jesuit Joseph Simons, but Gryphius' play apparently owes little to him,³ for the structure of the plot is entirely his own. In the characters and situations, however, one notices several reminiscences of his playgoing in Holland. Stachel has showed how at least two scenes were undoubtedly inspired by

¹ From Vondel's dedication to his translation of Sophocles's *Herkules in Trachin* (1668).

² Paul Stachel, in 'Seneca und das Deutsche Renaissancedrama' (*Palaestra*, XLVI, Berlin, 1907), points out how the same *motif* already occurs in Daniel Heinsius's *Herodes Infanticida* (1632), from which Vondel probably derived it.

³ P. Stachel, *op. cit.*, pp. 354–63. See also W. Flemming, 'Vondel's Einfluss auf die Trauerspiele des Andreas Gryphius' (*Neophilologus*, XIV (1929), *ab.* 2, p. 110).

similar ones in P. C. Hooft's drama, *Geeraerd van Velsen*,¹ which was repeatedly performed on the Amsterdam stage. He also points to a number of closely imitated individual lines.²

Vondel's influence on the play goes deeper. The characters in *Gysbreght van Aemstel* can be traced back to Virgil. But whereas Aeneas's wife Creusa remains a shadowy figure, Badeloch, the Lady of Aemstel, dominates the three last acts of Vondel's drama. She is a stronger, more interesting personality than Gysbreght himself. Full of love for her husband she trembles with anxiety at the forewarnings of calamity, but when the danger has become real she is prepared to fight the enemy in person. She refuses to leave the castle without Gysbreght; even the danger to her children cannot induce her to desert him.³

This picture of the heroic loving wife must have fascinated Gryphius. Whereas in the Byzantine chronicle and in Joseph Simons's play the Empress Theodosia's part is unimportant, Gryphius has made her the unwitting cause of her husband's death. She is the only character in the play which has come to life, and, as Willi Flemming has pointed out,⁴ she bears a strong resemblance to Badeloch, Vondel's heroine. Like her she is full of anxiety when awakening from a dream of ill omen, but when the worst has happened she proudly defies the enemy. The plot of the play is different, but the heroines react in the same way to similar experiences.

At the end of the second act of *Gysbreght van Aemstel* a chorus of noblemen, proceeding to the Nativity service, sing a hymn in praise of Christ. When this chorus has left the balcony of the stage, Badeloch appears on the platform with tears on her cheeks. Gysbreght enters, and asks her, full of concern, what is the matter. She then tells him her dream: how in a vision she saw her cousin Machteld, who prophesied calamity. The same succession of contrasting scenes occurs in Gryphius' *Leo Armenius*. There too a *Reyhen*, this time consisting of a chorus of priests and a chorus of maidens, antiphonally sing the praises of Christ.⁴ Then the curtain rises, and Theodosia is discovered sleeping in a chair. Awakening, she complains of a terrible dream. To her maid who enters,

¹ P. Stachel, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-14.

² One imitation observed by me of a both assonant and alliterating antithesis in Hooft's *Granida* (published 1615) may be mentioned here: *Granida*, 848: 'O rechten sonder reên! O wetten sonder weten!' *Leo Armenius*, II, 545: 'Ach freunde sonder treu! Ach nahmen sonder that!'

³ W. Flemming, *Neophilologus*, xiv (1929), afl. 2, pp. 110-11.

⁴ Like Vondel, Gryphius built this chorus on the contrast between the divinity of the child and its lowly birth, between the darkness and the light that was born into it. But the characteristic difference is that whereas Vondel's speculations arise out of his plastic depiction of the story, Gryphius' poem is entirely a structure of thought, to which the historical allusions serve as illustrations. This is the essential difference between Gryphius' and Vondel's lyric poetry generally.

and asks what is the cause of her depression, Theodosia recounts her dream, in which nearly all the stages of Badeloch's narrative can be retraced.

The origin of Vondel's dream-story is to be found in Virgil,¹ but comparison shows that the form which Gryphius gave to it is much nearer to Vondel than to either of the Latin authors. Flemming contends that there are no literal parallels in these corresponding scenes, but this is not quite true. One obvious echo deserves mentioning. When Theodosia has recounted her dream, there is a noise behind the stage, and shouts of "Murder!" are heard. In great alarm she cries:

O himmel! unser traum ist leider viel zu wahr!

This is almost a literal translation of Badeloch's words in Vondel's corresponding scene:

Bescherm ons, goede Godt! behoe ons voor gevaer!
'k Hoor onraet. *Och, ick zorg mijn droom is al te waer!*

The importance of a single reminiscence like this should not of course be estimated very highly. Scattered over Gryphius' whole work however there is a considerable number of lines which, consciously or unconsciously, echo Vondel's *Gysbreght van Aemstel*, and remarkably enough the prototypes of nearly all of these are to be found in the third act, especially in the dream-story. They form another confirmation of Flemming's view that it was the character of Badeloch and her relation to Gysbreght that fascinated Gryphius.

The lines which were obviously inspired by Vondel's *Gysbreght* (twenty in all) can be divided into two categories.² In the first a metaphor is taken over, unaltered in some cases, but more often in an elaborated form, in accordance with Gryphius' baroque style. The simple metaphor in *Gysbreght*:

Mijn liefste, wat is dit? Hoe ziet gij zoo beschreit?
Wat nevel van verdriet bezwalckt uw blinckende oogen?³

is elaborated by Gryphius into the following conceit (*Catharina von Georgien*, I, 729) with which Chach Abas addresses the weeping Catharina:

¹ Not in Seneca's *Troades*, as both Stachel and Flemming thought, though slight modifications may be due to influence of Andromache's dream in that drama.

² They are: *Leo Arm.* v, 8-10, from *Gysbreght*, 745 and 749; *Catharina v. Georgien*, I, 730, 731, from *Gysbreght*, 752, 753; *Leo Arm.* v, 5, from *Gysbreght*, 755; *Catharina*, I, 164, from *Gysbreght*, 756; *Leo Arm.* v, 27, from *Gysbreght*, 764; *Leo Arm.* v, 15, 16, from *Gysbreght*, 765; *Sonette*, v, no. 43, line 9, from *Gysbreght*, 815; *Leo Arm.* v, 35, 36, from *Gysbreght*, 816, 817; *Leo Arm.* v, 7-8, from *Gysbreght*, 817-19; *Leo Arm.* v, 58, from *Gysbreght*, 828; *Catharina*, I, 365-70, from *Gysbreght*, 1290-3; *Leo Arm.* v, 191, 192, from *Gysbreght*, 1689-90.

³ 'My love, what is this?...

What mist of sorrow tarnishes your shining eyes?'

*Hier finden wir die sonn', es mag der himmel prangen
Mit seiner flammen glantz. Wie? mit bethranten wangen?
Welch trüber nebel deckt ditz liebliche gesicht?
Was dreut der seufftzer wind? Es musse dieses licht,
Princessin, ihr und uns so angenehm erscheinen
Als dieses hertze wunscht!*

Vondel in the edition of 1659 worked out his metaphor by adding the line:

En heeft den hemel van uw aenschyn dus betogen?¹

Gryphius' drastic addition in line 4 however produces a Brobdignag effect which takes away all the dignity of the preceding image. It provides an essentially baroque exaggeration foreign to Vondel's style.

In the second group, which embraces about half of the lines mentioned above, the rhythm and syntactical structure of the original are imitated. Gryphius' tendency towards amplification and repetition usually extends such passages however, whereby the kinship is slightly obscured. Compare the following:

*Nu gij behouden zijt, is al mijn leet vergeten,
Mijn trouwe bruidegom, mijn hooft, mijn troost, mijn schat:
Nu gij behouden zijt, wat geef ik om de stadt,
Om al het wereldsch goet! hoe zijtge hier gekomen?*

Gysbreght, 1290-94.

*Nun acht ich keiner schmerzen,
Der sturm der angst vergeht. Die last von meinem hertzen
Verfällt auf diese stund! Ach, ketten, noth und stern
Sind mir ein kinderspiel, mein sohn, wenn dich allein
Der blitz nicht hat berührt! Mein sohn, nu du entgangen,
Mein sohn, nu du regierst, nun bin ich nicht gefangen!*

Catharina von Georgien, I, 365-70.

In this passage Vondel's influence appears in three ways. First of all the *motif* is the same: a sudden burst of joy at the rescue of a beloved person. But so is the process of thought; both women regard all other calamities as negligible now that their one anxiety is taken away. Lastly, the syntactical structure of Vondel's lines 1290 and 1291, which is almost identical, is imitated in Gryphius' lines 369 and 370, and reversed in the two preceding lines.

On examining the style of the two poems as a whole, however, one finds a profound difference. Gryphius is much nearer to Seneca's manner than to Vondel's. Theodosia's dream-story opens with a series of exclamations, followed by two rhetorical questions:

*Ach, grauenvolle nacht! Ha! schreckenreiche zeit!
Betrübte finsternis! Muss denn das grimme leid
Des kummers auch die ruh des müden schlaffs bestreiten?
Umgibt denn throne nichts als rauhe bitterkeiten?*

¹ 'And has thus overcast the heaven of your face?'

In order to intensify the effect of horror and foreboding, almost every noun is emphasized by a highly coloured adjective.

Vondel's atmosphere of apprehension is created by a gently insistent rhythm, in which only one heavy stress occurs; the eery sense of impending disaster is suggested by means of a hesitating introduction which gradually intensifies:

Mij leet, 'k en weet niet wat, een zwaarheit op 't hart
 Ick heb in mijnen slaep ijert schrickelijk vernomen.
 Een droom bezwaert mijn hart: gezichten doen me schromen.¹

Gryphius' introduction again sets in *fortissimo*:

Uns hat ein herber traum die kurtze rast gewehrt
 Die kalte brust erstarrt, doch schwitzen alle glieder;
 Der ganze leib erbebt. . .

It is in Gryphius' second tragedy, *Catharina von Georgien oder Beständige Keuschheit*, that Vondel's influence is most noticeable. This brings us to Gryphius' second visit to Holland. In 1647, on his way from Strassburg to Stettin, he spent the month of June in Amsterdam.² This time was fruitful in dramatic conceptions. It was then, during a night walk across a churchyard, that he told his Dutch friends the story which he was to dramatize in *Cardenio und Celinde*. We have this on his own authority,³ but the suggestion he received for another work can only be deduced from the play itself. *Catharina von Georgien* shows indebtedness to two of Vondel's tragedies: *Maeghden* (1639) and *Maria Stuart*. The latter drama had been published in 1646, a year before Gryphius' visit, and as it was a public sensation (the poet was fined 180 *gulden* because the Calvinist party considered it to be an attack on the Protestant religion),⁴ Gryphius must certainly have heard of it.

Vondel's tragedy *Maeghden* ("The Virgins") is a dramatization of the legend of St Ursula and her 11,000 virgins who are said to have been massacred by Attila, the king of the Huns. Its chief dramatic interest lies in Attila's inward conflict. He has captured Ursula, and her fate depends on him. But she is so beautiful that he has fallen in love with her, and wants to marry her. She is therefore invited to renounce her faith in order to become his queen, which she refuses to do. This gives rise to the usual episode in all Martyr-tragedies: a spirited religious

¹ "I feel, I know not what, there is a burden on my mind: in my sleep I have learned something terrible.—A dream weighs on my heart: visions make me fear" (ll. 756-8).

² W. Flemming, *Andreas Gryphius und die Bühne*, p. 77. (25th May departure from Strassburg; 25th July arrival in Stettin.)

³ See the *Vorrede*.

⁴ J. F. M. Sterck, *Het Leven van Vondel*, p. 124. See however *Vondel*, by A. J. Barnouw (New York and London, 1925), for a different explanation.

debate between Ursula and a heathen priest, of which the corresponding scene in Gryphius' drama contains some reminiscences. Attila's inward conflict therefore is one between love and honour, for since Ursula has insulted the heathen gods it is his duty to punish her. After some hesitation, honour overcomes love, and Ursula is killed.

This spiritual conflict between love and honour was the *motif* which Gryphius took over in order to render his tyrant interesting.¹ The historians had only recorded how Catharina, queen of Georgia, a Christian, had refused to renounce her faith in order to become the wife of Chach Abas, king of Persia. There was no mention of the Persian king being in love with his victim. So Gryphius derived from Vondel's play a *motif* which brought this character to life, but he improved upon it, as W. Flemming points out.² Vondel's Attila is a weakling, who allows himself to be swayed very readily by his priest, to whom he entrusts most of the parleying. Once Ursula is killed, he has finished with the whole episode. The appearance of her ghost merely frightens him.

Chach Abas on the other hand woos Catharina in person; he decides, in a fit of passion, to have her killed, and his remorse brings him to the verge of insanity. To the modern reader he, and not Catharina, is the tragic character of the play. As Gundolf says: one cannot perceive anything tragic in the martyrdom of an icy-cold miracle of chastity and endurance.

Gryphius' debt to Vondel's *Maria Stuart* is a structural one. Twice, in his first and in his fourth act, Gryphius adapted and modified the rhythmic succession of three contrasting scenes: the act opens on a note of depression; then a lady-companion enters with hopeful news, so that an escape from captivity seems suddenly possible, and immediately afterwards a fatal messenger enters.³

So far the two poets' dramatic technique proved very similar. But how profound a difference in spirit exists between them appears in their last acts. In *Leo Armenius* Gryphius had followed Vondel's method: the murdering of the emperor is related by a messenger. The same device is adopted in *Catharina von Georgien*, but in how different a fashion! In Vondel's fifth act the execution is over; Mary Stuart's physician, who has been present, now tells her father confessor what happened. He has passed the stage of violent grief, and looks back on the queen's last moments with wistful sadness, thinking how beautiful she was in her death.

¹ P. Stachel, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-30; W. Flemming, *Neophilologus*, xiv (1929), p. 112.

² *Neophilologus*, xiv (1929), pp. 113-15.

³ W. Flemming, *Neophilologus*, xiv (1929), pp. 116-18, gives a masterly analysis of *Catharina v. Georgien*, to which I am indebted for the above résumé.

With Gryphius we see Catharina's ladies in a state of terrible tension, while the queen is being tortured; a lady-in-waiting who has witnessed part of the execution rushes into the room in a state of hysterical horror, carrying a girl who has fainted; and while she is being revived, the lady gives a monstrously realistic account of the torture, which *is still going on*! Finally the back stage opens, and the spectators witness the queen's last moments. *Papinianus*, Gryphius' last tragedy, contains even worse cruelties.

All these are purely Senecan effects; Vondel's tragedies, even his early ones, offer nothing comparable. On the contrary, the current nineteenth-century objection to his plays was that in order to observe the unities he cut out the most dramatic events and had them told by messengers. If one replaces the word *dramatic* by *sensational*, this is quite true. Vondel did not strive after crude stage effects, but his aim was to show the drama that takes place within the minds of his characters. A careful examination of the nature of those events that in his plays are recounted by messengers will show that it is only in his weakest tragedies that this device is used with the object of observing the unity of place. The real reason nearly always is that in Vondel's opinion sudden violent calamities are either ridiculous, revolting or comparatively meaningless when shown, whereas description of them can be beautiful. This, the most fundamental quality of his dramatic art, has not been understood by any of his German disciples or translators, Gryphius included. This is the more remarkable in Gryphius' case because in *Leo Armenius* he used the messenger, and then gradually broke away from the classical practice. The passage just discussed marks the transition; in *Carolus Stuardus* the execution of the king takes place on the stage.

Part of Gryphius' reason for departing from Seneca's (and Vondel's) practice may have been that his audience proved incapable of enjoying a tragedy without sensational effects.¹ That such was indeed the case is borne out by a German prose version of Vondel's *Gebroeders* (1640): David Heidenreich's *Die Rache zu Gibeon oder die sieben Brüder aus dem Hause Sauls* (1662). Stachel² has shown that it is partly based on Gryphius' translation *Die Gibeoniter*, partly on the original. In this adaptation all the passages originally narrated by messengers have been transformed into actual scenes. The result conclusively proves Vondel's wisdom in not

¹ W. Flemming (*Andreas Gryphius und die Bühne*, pp. 242-3) is of the opinion that Gryphius' 'progress' was due to a conscious development: 'spricht deutlich für einen ziemlich bewussten Fortschritt des Barockdramatikers über klassizistische Regelmäßigkeit und Tradition hinaus.'

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 364-74.

having these particular events performed. In the original King David is the central character, while the seven sons of Saul are the object of his tragic dilemma. That is why their fate is kept in the background: a messenger narrates it to David, whose sorrow is the theme of the play, on which note it rightly ends. The adapter in replacing this scene by the representation of the execution upset the finely adjusted balance of Vondel's play: the spectators are made to forget David's tragedy for the pathetic brothers and their sensational end. Similarly, a wonderful description of the miracle that happened to the High Priest when Jehovah's will was revealed, which in Vondel's drama produces tension (for the messenger merely saw the supernatural event, but did not gather its meaning), becomes an opportunity for an unavoidably inadequate effort of stagecraft. The audience thus learns the content of the oracle at first hand, whereby the next scene, King David revealing the divine will to the Gibeonites, his enemies, is robbed of its point.

Gryphius' translation of *Gebroeders*, which he called *Die Sieben Brüder oder die Gibeoniter*, is his first drama. It is extremely interesting to compare this work with the original. For here we see the poet in the act of forming his dramatic style. Vondel's medium, the *dramatic alexandrine*,¹ had no counterpart in German poetry before Gryphius; it is true that Opitz had used the metre in his translations of Seneca and Sophocles, but in too primitive a form for it to serve the purpose of rendering Vondel's varied rhythm. In order to do so faithfully Gryphius followed the Dutch poet's versification, his idiom, even his actual words as closely as he possibly could. Many Dutch words and phrases were taken over, literally translated into German. A good many of them remained a permanent element of Gryphius' style, as so many proofs of the fact that he learnt his technique from Vondel.

The translation, though naturally wooden in parts, owing to this slavish copying, contains some excellent passages. Gryphius evidently must have taken great pains to reproduce the flexibility and variety of Vondel's alexandrines, and he often succeeded remarkably well. Vondel frequently has lines without a noticeable cæsura, which fall into three groups of four syllables (comparable to what is called 'le vers romantique' in the French romantic drama). These are usually reflected in Gryphius' translation,² which is the more remarkable, because in his original dramas they are extremely rare. The percentages occurring in the first 372 lines

¹ In the German *lyric* poetry of the period the alexandrine had of course become general some considerable time before, but the line had a different character there.

² Of the first 372 lines of *Gebroeders*, 38 (10.2 per cent) are without cæsura; the corresponding lines of *Die Gibeoniter* contain 35 such lines (9.4 per cent).

of *Catharina von Georgien*, *Cardenio und Celinde* and *Papinianus* are 2.6, 3.7 and 3.7 per cent respectively. With regard to run-on lines, however, Gryphius' practice seems very similar to Vondel's. The first 372 lines of Vondel's *Palamedes* (1625) contain 96 such lines, including doubtful cases, i.e. 25.8 per cent, those of *Gebroeders* (1640) 21.7 per cent, while the figures for Gryphius' *Gibeoniter* (between 1640 and 1644), *Catharina von Georgien* (1647-8) and *Papinianus* (1659) are 18.2, 19.8 and 19.8 per cent.

These results are surprising. For there is a vast difference between Vondel's and Gryphius' rhythms, which becomes apparent when one reads their poetry aloud. While even in Vondel's most regular lines the sentences seem to fall in with the metrical pattern, merely because this happens to suit the poet's purpose, and seldom lose their onward flow across cæsura and rhyme, Gryphius' thought follows the metre; it seems to receive a fresh impetus at each line, or even half-line. When the sentence does bridge these boundaries, this seems the result of a conscious effort.

This apparent contradiction between the results of analysis and the impression made on the ear is explained by the rhythmical structure of the lines. Gryphius' rhythm is more monotonous, which is due to the fixity of his cæsura. After all a classical alexandrine produces almost the same impression on the ear as does a rhymeless couplet of six-syllable lines. If therefore long passages of such alexandrines are varied only through the non-rhyming half-lines sometimes being linked syntactically, the rhymes, it is true, become less prominent, but the rhythmical monotony remains. Such is the case in Gryphius' original dramas. He very nearly achieves the same percentage of run-on lines as Vondel, but not his variety of rhythm, which is due to the combination of two devices: *enjambement* and avoidance of the cæsura.

Die Gibeoniter is full of another device very frequent in Dutch poetry: vowel elision. This was of course a generally accepted practice in German Renaissance poetry from Weckherlin and Opitz onwards. But it is noteworthy that the phenomenon is far more frequent in Gryphius' poetry than in that of Opitz.¹ Manheimer attributed it to Gryphius' striving after a pregnant, concentrated style, but there is a possibility that the development of the poet's technique in this respect may be partly due to the influence of Dutch poetry, of Vondel's in particular.

Manheimer was the first to observe a remarkable difference which exists between the *Lissa* edition (N, published 1637) of Gryphius' 'thirty-

¹ Victor Manheimer, *Die Lyrik des Andreas Gryphius*, p. 12: 'Die Elision ist viel zu häufig. Auf 100 Alexandriner des Gryphius kommen 20, des Opitz nur 3 Elisionen. Es gibt namentlich in den Tragödien Verse, in denen kein Wort unversehrt geblieben ist.'

one early sonnets¹ and his second volume of sonnets² on the one hand, and the third volume³ (of 1643, also at Leiden) on the other. (The last mentioned volume comprises a revision of twenty-nine of the *Lissa* sonnets, as well as twenty-one new ones.) He wrote:⁴ 'Die beiden ersten Ausgaben von 1637 und 1639 haben noch durchaus apokopierte Formen, mehr Apokopen als Elisionen. Erst durch die Verbindung mit dem Apokopeverbot wurde ja die Durchführung der neuen Accentregel so schwierig; und da Opitz selber oft genug der Not gehorchte, so war ein Anfänger noch weniger imstande, diese schwierige Rücksicht zu nehmen. Ein Umschwung lässt sich deutlich an der Bearbeitung der 1643 zum zweitenmal herausgegebenen Sonette erkennen; Gryphius' Anforderungen und zumal sein Können haben sich gesteigert. Er hat jetzt die Apokope verbannt... etc.'

Manheimer, it appears, explains the fact that Gryphius between 1639 and 1643 completely revised his attitude towards the use of apocope and elision by his growth in technical proficiency.

It seems questionable to me whether a mere increase in command of language can sufficiently account for such a revolution in metrical practice.⁵ To begin with, Gryphius' two books of sonnets which he published at Leiden in 1639 cannot be called a beginner's work. By that time he had completely mastered the kind of alexandrine whose metrical regularity is based on apocope and syncope and to some extent on elision. Why then explain this practice as a beginner's way out of difficulties? After all, the difficulty of elision to Gryphius cannot have been any greater than that of apocope, for neither phenomenon was an element of his natural speech, as is proved by the language of his comedy in the Silesian dialect, *Die Gelübte Dornrose*. For this play contains a great many syncopated forms, but hardly any examples of apocope or elision.

It is therefore more likely that until 1640 Gryphius saw no reason to favour elision above the two other practices, and hence calmly ignored Opitz's precept, which after all was arbitrary in its preference, and might not have been so generally accepted in theory, if it had not derived prestige from its Latin origin.

¹ *Andreae Gryphii Sonnete, Gedruckt zur Polnischen Lissa, durch Wigandum Funck.*

² *Andreae Gryphii/philos. et poet./Son- undt Feyrtags/Sonnete/1639 (Leiden, Elzevir).*

³ *Andreae Gryphii Sonnete. Das erste Buch.*

⁴ V. Manheimer, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

⁵ The following figures will show the importance of the change. Ruling out doubtful cases (dative -e, inclination, etc.) the 29 *Lissa* sonnets that were reprinted later on contain (in their original form) 53 elisions, 67 cases of apocope, 51 of syncope (not counting forms like *Feur* for *Feuer*). The first 29 of the *Leiden sonnets of 1639* contain 39 elisions, 57 apocopes, 43 syncopes. The 21 *new sonnets of 1643* contain 33 elisions, 11 apocopes, 23 syncopes. The 1643 revision of the 29 *Lissa* sonnets: 73 elisions, 14 apocopes, 23 syncopes.

By 1643 the principle of Gryphius' versification has suddenly changed: few cases of apocope remain, syncope has also become less frequent (but the change is not quite so radical here), and there is a considerable increase of elision. (Seventy-three cases in the Leiden revision as against fifty-three in the Lissa edition.)

A change as sudden as this can scarcely have been the outcome of a wholly independent development over four years. Some outside influence must have acted here, but what can it have been?

Two possibilities suggest themselves. Either Gryphius' views in the matter may have been influenced by one of the theoretical works that appeared at this time in Germany, or his contact with Dutch poetry may have brought about a change in poetical practice.

Between 1639 and 1643 several theoretical works appeared in Germany: *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft* (1640), Zesen's *Deutscher Helicon* (1640, 1641, and 1643), Gueinz (1641), Buchner (1642) and Titz (1642). Their teaching on the *Aussenlassung* varies little, as they all go back to Opitz's *Poeterey*, which appears from the fact that both the formulation of their rules and their examples are often identical. Seeing that Gryphius spent the years between 1639 and 1643 in Holland, however, he may not have read any of these works, but the chances are most favourable in the case of the *Deutscher Helicon*, because of Zesen's connexions with Amsterdam. Now Zesen, it is true, is more outspoken in his condemnation of apocope than Opitz had been in the curiously half-hearted precept:¹ 'Wann auff das *e* ein Consonans oder mitlautender Buchstabe folget, soll es nicht aussengelassen werden, obschon niemand biszher nicht gewesen ist, der in diesem nicht verstossen.' Zesen decreed:² 'Das *e* am ende des worts/wenn ein wort/welches sich mit einem mitlautenden anfängt/folget/kann gar nicht weggeworfen werden.' No more is said however; the remainder of this section deals with syncope, which is tolerated as long as the poet does not go beyond syncopations generally accepted in the spoken language. August Buchner's views are essentially the same.³

It is not likely that a stubbornly independent character like Gryphius should have been suddenly converted by a few apodictic precepts from a fellow-poet. The fact that Gryphius in these years also adopted the stricter form of the sonnet, and consequently revised all those of the *Lissa* sonnets where the sense ran on into the sestet, renders Zesen's influence on him even more problematic. For in the *Deutscher Helicon* the

¹ *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey* (Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. u. XVII. Jahrh., No. 1), p. 37.

² *Deutscher Helicon* (1641), p. 59.

³ I have not been able to consult copies of the other three works.

latter had rejected the theory of 'einen vornehmen und gelehrten freund' 'dass im Sonnet (es sey in wasserley Versen es wolle) mit dem achten verse die meinung sich je und allwege zugleich schlussen müsse und die folgenden sechs verse solten von selbigen achten durch einen kleinen raum abgesondert und unterschieden werden...', and defended the poet's right to complete freedom in this respect.

A poet's practice is much more likely to change through the example of other poets than in response to theories. But during Gryphius' stay in Holland his contacts with German poetry can only have been few and far between. On the other hand it is almost certain that the translation of Vondel's *Gebroeders* was written then, and it is worth considering whether in the course of reproducing Vondel's lines with such scrupulous accuracy Gryphius may not have learnt to appreciate the greater metrical smoothness due to the preponderance of elision over apocope, and gradually acquired it himself.

Of Vondel's *Gebroeders* the first 406 lines (I chose this number because it is equivalent to twenty-nine sonnets, the number examined above in the volumes of 1637, 1639 and 1643) contain 97 elisions, 17 cases of apocope and 26 of syncope.

In the corresponding passage of Gryphius' *Gibeoniter* I counted 97 elisions, 20 cases of apocope and 27 of syncope. The proportional as well as the absolute frequency of these devices is therefore essentially the same in both poems, and very similar to that in the *Leiden* revised edition of the twenty-nine *Lissa* sonnets. In the twenty-one new sonnets of this volume the preponderance of elision over the two other phenomena is not quite so marked, which is what one would expect. For it is probably easier thoroughly to revise past work in accordance with a new principle than to realize it in a new volume. On examining Gryphius' rendering in detail, always comparing the original, I observed how in many cases the elisions were due to his close copying of the Dutch line. This is evident in the following passage:¹

{ 'k Verzekert U. Mij docht, ick hoorde een groot gedruis
 { Glaubt mir! mich daucht', ich hört' ein schütterndes gebräus'
 { Gelijck een storremwind, waervan het gansche huis
 { Gleich einem schnellen sturm, darvon das gantze haus
 { En d' aerde en wat er was beweeghde, en loeide en brulde...
 { Und erd', und was da steht bewegt' erbebt' und brüllte....

Four of Vondel's elisions are reproduced with the same words in the same positions; it is evident that Gryphius was almost forced to apply the principle here. Extreme cases like these are naturally rare, but the number of

¹ *Gebroeders*, 236-8; *Die Gibeoniter*, II, 49-51.

elisions in the German poem which are either formed by the same words, or in the same position of the line, or both, is considerable. The first 406 lines contain 97 elisions. Of these, 24 are reproductions of elisions in the original,¹ but in addition I noted 14 cases where a monosyllabic Dutch word followed by an initial vowel had to be rendered by an unapocopated German one,² so that to a German poet the use of elision was obviously indicated. (The succession 'docht, ick' in the first line quoted is a case in point.) On the other hand I found only three cases where apocope was due to imitation of the same device in the Dutch. It is evident from these facts that in the course of translating Vondel the usefulness of elision as a means of achieving greater concentration must have strongly suggested itself to Gryphius.

It might be argued that the above data tend to show that the increased use of elision in Gryphius' poetry from 1640 onwards is less noticeable than the decrease of apocope, so that the negative object of avoiding the latter device would seem to have caused the change. Such is indeed the case, and this must have been Manheimer's reason for attributing the *Umschwung* to 'das Apokopeverbot'. But his view does not provide an answer to the question why Gryphius should have tarried so long in observing this prohibition. Even supposing that either Opitz's or Zesen's condemnation of apocope was the original cause of his desire to effect the change, it still seems likely that his study of Vondel enabled the poet to carry this ideal into practice. But the assumption of such an impetus from Germany is by no means necessary, for Vondel, too, avoided apocope almost completely. It is true that his poetry contains both the full and the apocopated forms of the third person singular of the present subjunctive (*hij kome* and *hij koom*; *men vrage* and *men vraag*), but these apocopations were founded on common usage among educated speakers, as is proved by letters of the period.³ Apocopations that run counter to the spoken language, such as Gryphius' frequent monosyllabic forms 'hört', 'die stein',⁴ do not occur in Vondel's mature work. The 17 apocopations in the above-mentioned passage of *Gebroeders* are all examples of two apocopated forms which Vondel permits himself: *ons* (for the inflected possessive *onze*) and *dees* (for *deze*). Besides cases of these, there are only 5

¹ I.e., I, ll. 37, 38, 57, 58, 148; II, ll. 44, 49, 51 (thrice), 57, 59, 76, 79, 87, 130, 155, 156, 216, 244, 257 (twice), 259, 264.

² I.e., I, ll. 24, 45, 89; II, ll. 41, 43, 49, 130, 155, 165, 178, 189, 190, 196, 242.

³ See J. H. Kern, 'Over de Taal van de brieven van Huygens' zusters en D. van Dorp' (*Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XLVIII (1929), p. 102), and also W. van Helten, *Vondel's Taal*, I, p. 49.

⁴ These forms were of course consistent with *Oberdeutsch* usage. But in the seventeenth-century *Ostmitteldeutsch* such apocopations must have been so rare (see H. Paul, *Deutsche Grammatik*, I, § 104) that with Gryphius they are to be regarded as poetical liberties.

apocopations in the whole drama, so that it contains 57 in all, spread over 1792 lines, i.e. an average of 3.2 per 100 lines, as against averages of 14.0 and 16.5 in Gryphius' sonnets of 1637 and 1639. Vondel's work could therefore furnish Gryphius with an example of poetry practically free from unnatural apocopation, and the translating of the tragedy *Gebroeders* may very well have induced him to banish this device to the best of his ability from his later work.

The intense study of this drama was bound to leave further traces in Gryphius' work. Stachel and Flemming have noted a number of lines that must be considered as mere replicas of lines in Vondel's play. In the age of the *centones* from various classical authors such close imitations cannot be regarded in the same way, of course, as they would be in modern times. They may be reminiscences, but it is equally possible that, like similar literal echoes from other dramas of Vondel's, they are the result of notes taken by Gryphius during his reading. In the latter case they merely show an admiration for such lines as being good *sententiae*, but can scarcely be regarded as evidence of Vondel's influence.

A metaphor of Vondel's however which appears repeatedly, each time in a different form, is another matter. Such a figure of style must have fascinated the poet, and in the course of being turned over in his mind it gradually became transformed into something kindred and yet different. Images that are the outcome of such a process must be regarded as evidence of the productive influence which is termed *Anregung*.

A characteristic example is the development of the metaphors in *Gebroeders*, 410-11:

Wij willen Sauts asch gaen ziften, 't fijn en't grof,
En lachen, als de wind noch guichelt met zijn stof.¹

The two metaphors reappear unaltered in one of Gryphius' sonnets (*Palm, Lyr. Ged. Sonette* IV, no. 17):

Die zeit hat gantze reich als asch' in wind gesiebt
· · · · · nur treue gunst besteht
Wenn Pergamus in glut und Rom in staub vergeht
In staub der Tyber last, das gauckelspiel der winde.

and *Leo Armenius*, II, 332, affords another example of 'das gauckelspiel der winde'. But the same drama contains two interesting developments of the other metaphor:

Theodosia. Bedenckt den hohen tag, der alle welt erfreut!
Leo. Und mich, wenn nun der wind des feindes asch umstreut.²

¹ *Gibeoniter*, II, 221:

"Wir woll'n des wuttrichs asch aussieben grob und klein
Und lachen, wenn sie wird ein spiel der winde seyn."

² *Leo Armenius*, II, 518.

and especially:

Der, den mein degen setzte
Auf Constantinus' thron, setzt mich auf diesen stoss!
Der furst, vor den mein blut aus allen adern floss,
Schenkt mir dss holtz zu lohn! Wie hoch bin ich gestiegen,
Dass auch die aschen selbst wird durch die lufte fliegen!¹

If it is borne in mind that *Leo Armenius*, Gryphius' first drama (published in 1646), is full of various reminiscences from Hooft and Vondel, and may at least partly have been written shortly after *Die Gibeoniter*, and further that the three last-mentioned instances of this metaphor all occur in the second act of *Leo Armenius*, and in the order in which they are here quoted, it becomes difficult to dismiss the frequent recurrence of this *motif* as wholly due to the subject-matter of the passage. The very fact that each of these figures is a stage further removed from the original trope suggests that the metaphor was a sort of obsession to the poet, and that his subconscious mind developed it further as he wrote.

The same phenomenon is to be observed in Gryphius' use of various Vondelian constructions. Rarely does he take these over unaltered; as a rule the device of style, whatever it is, is repeated two or three times or even more, probably in order to achieve a rhetorical climax. Vondel frequently has exclamations in the form of a negative question with a positive meaning, such as:

Wat stormen waelden mij niet sedert over't hooft?²

In his *Maria Stuart* (422-3) the figure is used twice in succession; instances of threefold use do not occur to my knowledge. Catharina von Georgien however exclaims:³

Was hab ich nicht gesehn! was hab ich nicht erlitten!
Was hab ich nicht beklagt! wie bin ich nicht bestritten!
Was hab ich nicht erlebt! und was erfahr ich noch!

Another favourite figure of Vondel's taken over by Gryphius was noted by Stachel:⁴ the opening verb: 'Ik zie' followed by a large number of accusative + participle constructions, varied by *accusativi cum infinitivo*; the figure is sometimes preceded by an introductory 'mij dunkt'. The construction of course occurs in Latin poetry, but Gryphius' use of it for building alexandrines in which the caesura usually separates two *accusativi cum participio* was probably inspired by Vondel.⁵

The problem of Gryphius' relation to Vondel becomes exceedingly difficult where both poets are influenced by Seneca. Stachel and Flem-

¹ *Leo Armenius*, II, 552-6.

² *Gysbreght van Aemstel*, 868.

³ *Catharina von Georgien*, I, 281-3. See also *ibid.*, I, 233-4.

⁴ P. Stachel, *op. cit.*, pp. 239, 272.

⁵ Examples: Vondel, *Maeghden*, 1750 sqq., *Palamedes*, 363 sqq.; *Lucifer*, 2056 sqq.; Gryphius, *Carolus Stuartus*, III, 537 sqq.; *Papinianus*, I, 49 sqq.

ming tend to dismiss parallels between *Palamedes*, Vondel's Senecan tragedy, and Gryphius' *Papinianus*, on the ground that these are sufficiently explained by Seneca, their common example. Thus Stachel¹ attributes to the example of *Troades*, I, 1 sqq., and to Opitz's translation all those passages in *Leo Armenius* and *Papinianus* where the *Quicumque*-construction occurs. It is obvious that the passage which he quotes from the former drama (*Leo Armenius*, II, 1-8) shows this influence very clearly, and the other passages do not furnish any arguments against Senecan influence. But is it not possible that Vondel's use of the figure in *Palamedes* (I, 1-7 and III, 947-66) may have strengthened Gryphius' predilection?

The figure has one feature there which the opening sentence of *Troades* lacks: the *apodosis* is followed by a series of exclamations in the form of rhetorical questions. Now both *Leo Armenius*, I, 291-303, and *Papinianus*, I, 1-10, typical examples of the same figure, are rounded off in a similar way, the former by one rhetorical question, the latter by two semi-interrogative exclamations.² Influence of Vondel superimposed on a Senecan construction is at any rate possible here, although it cannot be proved. It is also noteworthy that the unusual syntactic complexity of the figure in *Papinianus*, I, 1-10, is even surpassed by the intricacy of Vondel's other passage of this kind, *Palamedes*, III, 947-66.

The kinship of the opening monologues of these two dramas was first observed by R. Kollewijn;³ unfortunately however he did little more than print side by side a number of parallel passages. Of late Flemming has argued that these parallels were of little importance, since most of the *motifs* and figures they contain can be traced back either to Seneca or to some Greek tragedy.⁴ This is true in so far that isolated instances of most of these figures can be found in various classical authors. The point is, however, that nearly all the stages of Papinianus' argument, even to formulas of transition, occur in *Palamedes*' exposition, *in the same order*. The oratorical devices of *Palamedes*' *oratio pro domo*: dramatic presentation of imaginary accusers, who are immediately refuted by the protagonist in rhetorical questions and contemptuous exclamations: the con-

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 268.

² Compare also: *Carolus Stuardus*, III, 515-25, 649-56. Examples of the construction without the concluding exclamations are more frequent however; I mention *Leo Arm.* I, 121-8, 326-34, II, 1-8; *Carolus*, II, 41-2, 161-6, 233-4, 237-40; *Catharina*, II, 133-9, 145-8; *Papinianus*, I, 153-6, 367-9, IV, 13-18, V, 48-54.

³ R. Kollewijn, *Ueber den Einfluss des Hollaendischen Dramas auf Andreas Gryphius* (Diss. Leipzig, 1880), pp. 26-42.

⁴ *Neophilologus*, XIV (1929), p. 191; see also p. 192: 'So ist von der engen Beziehung zwischen dem *Papinian* und dem *Palamedes*... nichts geblieben, abgesehen von ein paar Zeilen mit Einzelformulierungen.'

cluding passage: 'and this is my reward': these are all reflected in Papinianus' argument, but the striking resemblance in structure is a more convincing proof of Vondel's influence. Gryphius' introductory passage (1-67) is original. But from then onwards the argument proceeds along the same lines as in *Palamedes*, as a detailed comparison of the two poems shows.¹ They run parallel in essentials as far as *Papinianus*, 151. Gryphius' conclusion then departs from Vondel's example; instead of following *Palamedes*, 142-66, the prologue is rounded off with a *Quicumque*-construction which both in form and motif was inspired by *Palamedes*, 1-3.

The history of Vondel's reputation during his lifetime is very similar to Rembrandt's. Both artists enjoyed a certain measure of popularity during their middle periods, but when their work grew less spectacular and more profound, they no longer found favour with the general public. In Vondel's case this was due to the fact that in his later plays there is little action on the stage. There could not be, for they are all variations of one tragic conflict: the struggle in the human mind between self-will and the grace of God. The falls of Lucifer, Adam, Solomon, Jephthah and Samson are all symbolic of the tragic fate that awaits Man's presumption.

In a drama of this kind violent action would be out of place. In Vondel's later plays the dramatic tension is brought about by the spiritual conflict that rages in the minds of the protagonists. Their words are not a direct expression of their feelings, for that would have rendered them individual characters, whereas Vondel needed symbolic types for his purpose.² Their passions are sublimated into poetry, and as such they call forth in the audience the thoughtfully compassionate emotion which is the dominant atmosphere of Vondel's tragedies.

Gryphius left Holland before *Salomon*, Vondel's first tragedy of this kind, appeared, and he does not seem to have read any of the later works except the festival play *De Leeuwendalers*, from which he derived the plot and one scene of his comedy *Die Gelibte Dornrose*. Gryphius' tragedies *Carolus Stuardus* and *Papinianus* contain echoes of the early Vondel, but nothing in them suggests even the most superficial acquaintance with Vondel's *Salomon* or *Lucifer*. It is highly improbable, however, that these dramas should have pleased Gryphius, supposing he had known them, for the course of Vondel's development was diametrically opposed to his own. In Vondel's career the Senecan phase was an

¹ Compare *Palamedes*, 11-14 and *Papinianus*, 68-9; *Pal.* 15-22 and *Pap.* 69-70; *Pal.* 23-34 and *Pap.* 71-84; *Pal.* 35-41 and *Pap.* 85-7; *Pal.* 41-6 and *Pap.* 87-90 and 94-8; *Pal.* 47-9 and *Pap.* 99-101; *Pal.* 61-70 and *Pap.* 113-14; *Pal.* 115-38 and *Pap.* 129-51; *Pal.* 139-40 and *Pap.* 151.

² A. Verwey, *Vondel's Vers*, pp. 69-70.

episode on the way to Virgil and Euripides, whereas Gryphius' last tragedy is the most Senecan of all his dramas.¹

The tragedies of Vondel's middle period remained popular on the Amsterdam stage, and some of them also formed part of the repertoire of the Dutch players who travelled all over North Germany, Denmark and Sweden during the latter half of the seventeenth century.² Junkers has a list of performances given by Dutch players in Germany of which there is reasonable certainty, thirty-three items extending over the period from 1649 till 1741. Their repertoire is very imperfectly known: in twenty-one cases no titles of plays are recorded, and only with regard to seven performances has a detailed account of the repertoire been preserved. It appears that many verse translations of Spanish and French dramas were given; further a considerable number of Dutch farces and comedies, as well as some serious Dutch dramas in verse. Among these Hooft's *Paris' Oordeel* is mentioned once (Altona, 1665); the repertoire of Rijndorp's company in 1703, according to Overskou,³ contained some plays of Vondel's (they visited Hamburg, Lübeck, Kiel and Danzig as well as Denmark); *Gysbreght van Aemstel* was performed at Hamburg in 1740; and the Joseph-trilogy (*Joseph in Dothan*, *Joseph in Egypten*, and Vondel's translation of Grotius' *Sofomponeas*) was produced in the same city in 1741. Evidently Vondel was only produced occasionally, but it should be borne in mind that the extreme poverty of the material available renders unreliable any conclusion as to the number of Vondel plays that were produced. Junkers found Schwering's⁴ results untenable in many respects, but he was unable once more to examine the archives of the North-German towns.⁵ The fact that the German *Wanderbühne* (Johannes Velten and others) had in their repertoire⁶ some adaptations of Vondel tragedies suggests that they had seen them performed by the Dutch players, their competitors, with some success. In that case they must have been produced rather less infrequently than our present data seem to suggest.

Two such German adaptations of Vondel have been preserved: Heidenreich's *Gibeoniter* (see above) and Christophorus Kormarten's version of *Maria Stuart* (1667). If the lost German adaptations were of the same kind they cannot have given the spectators a correct impression

¹ See P. Stachel, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

² See Herbert Junkers, *Niederländische Schauspieler und Nederl. Schauspiel im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert in Deutschland* (Haag, 1936), a careful reconsideration of Schwering's and Bolte's material and conclusions.

³ *Den Danske Skueplads*, I, pp. 121 sqq. (Copenhagen, 1854).

⁴ Julius Schwering, *Zur Geschichte des niederl. u. spanischen Dramas in Deutschland* (Münster, 1895).

⁵ Junkers, *Vorrede*, p. ix.

⁶ Junkers, pp. 157-61.

of Vondel's art. For Kormarten's play¹ is rather worse than Heidenreich's *Gibeoniter*; it has no more in common with the original than the subject-matter and the plot. The medium is a consistently pedestrian prose; most of the similes and metaphors are either cut altogether or perverted. The fact that here, too, Vondel's description of the execution is staged in a crudely realistic way proves that no producer in seventeenth-century Germany dared present to his audience a play without sensational effects.

The drama of Lohenstein, Gryphius' most important successor, is a case in point. The two qualities of Gryphius' tragedies that are most foreign to Vondel, his sensationalism and his tendency to bombast, became prominent features of Lohenstein's work. At the same time Stachel's interesting list of dramatic *motifs* in the German Baroque drama which go back to Vondel shows that for these both Lohenstein and Hallmann stand in Vondel's debt, if only via Gryphius.

One is tempted to conclude from these facts that Vondel's direct influence on the German drama after Gryphius did no more than provide the stage with some new subject-matter, witness a number of mangled stage versions of his plays.

Actually the time for any such sweeping conclusion has not yet come. Seeing that very few investigators of German seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century literature have been intimately acquainted with Vondel's enormous work, it is quite possible that he may have exerted an influence on some German poet of this period which so far has escaped the attention of scholars.

This is especially true with regard to a literary centre such as Hamburg, where until late in the eighteenth century the whole intellectual life was greatly influenced by Holland, owing to active commercial and cultural relations with Amsterdam. It was at Hamburg that Vondel's *Joseph*-trilogy was performed on the 20th of April, 1741, a century after it was written. This performance may have been witnessed by the author of a remarkable poem, the manuscript of which was discovered and published in 1920 by Paul Piper.² It is an epic with episodes in dialogue on the life of Joseph, which Piper believed to be Goethe's lost poem on the subject. A literary quarrel between a number of scholars followed, in which opinions as to Goethe's authorship were divided, until in 1929 Fritz Tschirch,³ on both linguistic and stylistic grounds, proved that the poem

¹ He also seems to have adapted *Lucifer*, *David in Ballingschap* and *Palamedes*, but these versions have not been preserved (Junkers, p. 261).

² *Joseph, Goethe's erste grosse Jugendsichtung wieder aufgefunden und zum ersten Male herausgegeben von...* Paul Piper (Hamburg, 1920).

³ F. Tschirch, *Der Altonaer 'Joseph', Goethes angebliche Jugendsichtung* (Berlin, 1929).

could not be the work of Goethe, but that it must have been written between 1690 and 1740, in some part of Low Germany lying roughly between the Weser and the Oder. Ernst Beutler in his review of Tschirch's work¹ pointed towards Hamburg as the most probable place of origin.

The poem itself shows no greater similarity to Vondel's plays than might be expected from the fact that both versions are founded on the Bible story. But the manuscript also contained a sort of supplement written in the same hand, which appears to be an improved version of one of the dialogues. Now this scene is so closely modelled on a passage in the second act of Vondel's *Joseph in Dothan* that it reads almost like a translation, as Tschirch observes.

How can this remarkable supplement have originated? Apparently the poet, when writing his epic, was not acquainted with Vondel's tragedies on the subject. But after it was completed, he must either have read *Joseph in Dothan*, or else seen it on the stage. In any case it pleased him so much that he rewrote one of his episodes in imitation of Vondel's work. That is all we can tell from what has been preserved, but the fragment ends abruptly, in the middle of a sentence, so that possibly the rewritten scene may have extended further. If the poet lived in Hamburg, he may have become acquainted with the play through the performance of 1741.

This discovery is important in two respects. One gains the impression that the strolling Dutch players may have exerted some influence on the German poetry of the time, therefore it becomes more worth while to investigate their movements. And further one realizes how easily Vondel's influence on German poets of this period may have been overlooked. If the question of Goethe's authorship had not arisen, or if the subject of the poem had been a different one, the similarity to Vondel might never have been noticed.

Evidently the time for a final conclusion as regards Vondel's influence on German literature has not yet come. We can only judge by what is known at present; new discoveries may compel us to modify our theories. Allowing for this, one may say that Vondel's influence affected the subject-matter and the technique of the German verse drama, especially that of Gryphius, its greatest representative. The spirit of Vondel's drama found little response in him, but his style owes more to the Dutch poet than is commonly supposed.²

TH. WEEVERS.

LONDON.

¹ *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (1931), Heft 2.

² I should like to record my sense of gratitude to the Research and Publications Fund of Bedford College for so kindly contributing towards the cost of publishing this article.

THE DATE OF ÆTHELRED'S TREATY WITH THE VIKINGS: OLAF TRYGGVASON AND THE BATTLE OF MALDON¹

AMONG the state papers which have come down from the reign of King Æthelred 'the Redeless' is the text of a treaty of peace arranged between the king and his *witan* on the one hand and a viking force commanded by Anlaf, Iustin and Guðmund son of Stegita on the other hand. This treaty is included among some miscellaneous pieces in a manuscript of Old English laws,² and it is printed in various editions of the Old English laws as 'II Æthelred'; reference will be made here to the edited text of F. Liebermann in his *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen* (I, pp. 220 f.).

The occurrence of Anlaf's name as one of the viking leaders named in the prologue of the treaty proves that it must have been arranged at some time within the years 991-4. Anlaf is identical with the famous Ólafur Tryggvason, afterwards King of Norway and hero of the well-known sagas bearing his name. He is known to have come to England about 990 or 991, and after making peace with the English in the late autumn of 994 he sailed away to Norway, and never returned to the British Isles.³ During the time when there was a possibility of Anlaf's presence in England two treaties were made with the vikings, one in 991 after the battle of Maldon, and one in late October or early November 994; both of these are recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. No one has ever doubted that Æthelred's treaty with Anlaf and his two colleagues belongs to one or other of these occasions, and most scholars who have considered the

¹ Since this article was submitted to the editors of the *Modern Language Review*, the two problems with which it is concerned have been dealt with by Dr E. D. Laborde in his recently published book *Byrhmōth and Maldon*, pp. 43 f. Dr Laborde has covered some of the same ground as my article, and he has reached the same conclusions, that the treaty should be dated 994 and that Olaf was probably not present at the battle of Maldon. Dr Laborde does not, however, discuss the interpretation of the treaty or answer Liebermann's weightier objections to assigning the treaty to 994. Thus Archbishop Sigeric could not have negotiated the general treaty in 994, as Dr Laborde states on p. 46, because, as Liebermann pointed out, he died before the negotiations for general peace could have been initiated. Similarly it is difficult to hold with Dr Laborde that the chronology of the Scandinavian records precludes Olaf's presence at the battle. Since my article differs from his views at certain points, and gives more detailed treatment to various evidences and difficulties, I have published it in the form in which it was originally submitted.

² Cambridge, Corpus Christi 383, p. 88; this MS. is dated c. 1125. See F. Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, I, p. xix.

³ The limits of Olaf's stay in the west are derived from the Scandinavian sources, discussed below, and their dating of Olaf's return harmonizes perfectly with the record in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* of Olaf's treaty with Æthelred in 994, and Florence of Worcester's statement that he sailed for Norway in the late autumn of 994.

problem have selected 991 as the more likely of the alternative dates.¹ This choice has been based primarily on the common assumption that Anlaf was the leader of the viking army at Maldon and on the belief that Archbishop Sigeric is named in the treaty text as a negotiator of the peace with the vikings. Since it is at least doubtful whether Anlaf was present at Maldon, and he is certainly evidenced in the campaign and peace of 994, and since the part ascribed to Sigeric in the treaty text can be variously interpreted, there is a case for investigating the whole problem afresh.

The scope of the treaty and its terms seem to apply more naturally to 994 than to 991. The terms are quite general: this treaty is not merely an agreement such as is proposed by the viking messenger in the poem on the battle of Maldon, that the vikings shall cease hostilities and leave the district in return for a payment of money; it does mention a payment of tribute, but it also aims at regulating relations between the whole English nation² and the viking host in the future. Now the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* states that the truce of 991 was arranged by Archbishop Sigeric, and nothing is said of the king acting in the matter; this is the account in version C (with which D and E agree in almost every word):

dcccc.xci. Her was Gypeswic gehergod. 7 æfter þon swiðe raðe was Brihtnop ealdorman ofslegen æt Mældune. 7 on þam geare man gerædde þæt man gæld ærest gafol Denescum mannum. for ðam miclum brogan þe hi worhton be ðam sæ-riman: þæt was ærest .x. ðusend þ. Þene ræd gerædde ærest Syric arcebiscep.

The late Canterbury text F omits the statement about the devastation of Ipswich, but agrees otherwise. The Winchester version (A) wrongly enters these events under 993 and mingles them with events belonging to 994;³ but it names the places ravaged as Stan (? Folkestone), Sandwich and Ipswich. As Sigeric alone bore the responsibility for this truce (he is afterwards called 'Siricius Danegeld' in one document) it would seem that the peace of 991 was only of local application, a purchase of peace for the ravaged provinces—Suffolk, Essex and Kent. The payment of £10,000 accords with this impression, when compared with the £22,000 stated in the treaty text to have been paid. Æthelred's treaty was definitely not of

¹ Schmid, Freeman, Steenstrup, Napier and Stevenson, Keary, Plummer, Thomas Hodgkin, Oman, Liebermann, Miss Robertson, Miss Ashdown, and K. Sisam have either argued for 991 or accepted this date from others; only Kemble and Worsaae have favoured 994.

² The first clause begins thus: 'Ðæt ærost, þæt woruldfrið stande betweox Æthelrede cyngre 7 eallum his leodscype 7 eallum ðam here...' See below, p. 27.

³ The confirmation of Anlaf recorded in this annal certainly belongs to 994, and the battle of Maldon no less certainly to 991. The beginning of the annal 'Her on ðissum geare com Unlaf mid ðrim 7 hund nigontigon scipum...' is an inaccurate copy of the beginning of the 994 annal: 'Her on þissum geare com Anlaf 7 Swegen...mid.iii. 7 hund nigontigum scipum...' See Plummer, *Chronicle*, II, p. 173. The beginning and end belong to 994, the middle part to 991.

local application: clause 6 states that if the truce is broken in any town, the *burhwaru* must arrest the slayers, and if they will not act, then the ealdorman must; and if he will not, then the king; and if he will not, then the whole *ealdordom* will be outside the truce. If this had been intended to apply only to one or two provinces, these would naturally have been specified.

The raids and peace of 994 are described in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (version C, with which D, E and F agree closely) thus:

deccc.xciii. Hér on ðissum geare côm Anlaf 7 Swegen to Lundenbyrig. on Natiuitas S̅c̅e Mariæ mid ini. 7 hundnigontigum secpum. 7 hi ða on þá buruh fæstlice feohtende wæron. 7 eac hi mid fyre ontendon woldan. ac hi þær geferdon maran hearm 7 yfel þonne hi æfre wendon þæt him ænig buruhwaru gedón sceolde. Ac seo halige Godes moder. on þam dæge. hire mildheortnesse þære buruhware gecyðde. 7 hi ahredde wið heora feondum. 7 hi þanone ferdon. 7 worhton þæt mæste yfel ðe æfre æni here gedon meahste. on bærnætte 7 heregunge. 7 on manslyhtum. ægþer ge be ðam sæ riman. 7 on Eastseaxum. 7 on Kentlande. 7 on Suðseaxum. 7 on Hamtunscire. 7 æt neaxtan namon him hōrs. 7 rīdon him swā wide swā hi woldan. 7 unasecgendlice yfel wyrcegende wæron. Þa gerædde se cyning 7 his witan. þæt him man to sende. 7 him behet gafol 7 metsunge. wið þon ðe hi þære heregunge geswicon. 7 hi ða þæt underfengon. 7 com þa eall se here to Hamtune. 7 ðær winter setl namon. 7 hi mon þær fedde geond eall Westseaxena rice. 7 him mon geald feos xvi. ðusend ꝥ. Þa sende se cyning æfter Anlafe cynges Ælfeah bisceop 7 Æþelweard ealdorman. 7 man gislude þa hwile into þam secpum. 7 hi ða læddon Anlaf. mid miclum wurðscipe. to þam cyninge. to Andeferan. 7 se cyning Æþelred his onfeng æt bisceopes handa. 7 him cynolice gifode. 7 him þa Anlaf behet. swa he hit eac gelæste. þæt he næfre eft to Angelcynne mid unfriðe cuman nolde.

It is evident from this account that the ravaging in that year was widespread, and that the peace finally made was a national treaty made by the king, just as in the extant treaty text. The victualling of the vikings mentioned in the annal accords with clause 1. i of the treaty: 7 *we him sculon mete findon, ða hwile ðe hy mid us beoð*. Then the treaty, with its care for the various contingencies that may arise in the future, is evidently intended to be a permanent peace, as that of 994 actually was; Olaf never again visited England with hostilities. But if the treaty is dated 991, it must be recognized that Olaf violated it by plundering Æthelred's realm again in 994 and (if the Scandinavian evidences are accepted) even in the year following the treaty, 992. Such a blatant breach of faith was not in Olaf's character as we know it from the sagas.

Scholars have found many difficulties, however, which they consider make it impossible to assign the treaty to 994. These difficulties have been stated most fully and definitely by Liebermann.¹ In his introduction to the treaty text he observes that (a) the treaty is not stated in the text to be a continuation or extension of the truce of 991, even though, if the treaty belongs to 994, this would be only three years later; (b) it is a

¹ *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, III, p. 150.

political agreement without any reference to an undertaking by Olaf to be confirmed; (c) in the first clause Sigeric is named as a negotiator (together with two others), and he is said in the *Chronicle* to have arranged the peace of 991, while Ælfeah who helped to negotiate in 994 is not mentioned; (d) Sigeric died at the end of October 994, before the treaty was concluded; (e) the three negotiators named in the first clause are also named by Florence of Worcester as negotiators in 991. In an article published earlier¹ Liebermann also objected that (f) no mention is made in the treaty of Olaf's partner in the raiding of 994, Swegen of Denmark. The first of these objections is negligible, and most of the others have been created by Liebermann himself by unjustifiable inferences from the first clause of the treaty, which runs thus:

Dæt ærost, þæt woruldfrið stande betweox Æthelrede cyng 7 eallum his leodscipe 7 eallum ðam here ðe se cyng þæt feoh sealde æfter ðam formalan ðe Sigeric arcebisceop 7 Æðelwerd ealdormann 7 Ælfric ealdorman worhton, ða hi abædon æt ðam cyngre þæt hy mostan ðam læppan frið gebicegan ðe hy under cyngre hand ofer hæfdon.

Liebermann inferred from this that Sigeric, Æthelweard and Ælfric together negotiated the general treaty for the king, and most of his objections to dating the treaty 994 are based on this inference. The meaning of the passage, however, seems to be: 'This first, that worldly peace² be established between King Æthelred and all his people and the whole viking host, to which the king has paid tribute in accordance with the agreements which Archbishop Sigeric and Ealdorman Æthelweard and Ealdorman Ælfric arranged, after they had obtained permission, upon request, from the king to purchase peace for the districts which they ruled over, subject to the king's sovereignty.'

Thus the three lords negotiated only on behalf of their own districts, and are not said to have had any part in the negotiation of the general treaty of peace with the vikings. The most natural interpretation of the statement is that each of the three, Sigeric, Æthelweard and Ælfric, had bought off the vikings from their own districts by payments of money or by promises and that cognizance of these local agreements is taken later in arranging the general treaty, which will contain similar terms. Thus there is no reason why the three lords named in this clause of the treaty should be identical with the negotiators of the general peace specified in the *Chronicle* (Ealdorman Æthelweard and Bishop Ælfeah). And the statement that local truces had been purchased by Sigeric, Æthelweard

¹ *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, xi, p. 23 f.

² Peace in respect of the warfare of this world; the word merely implies that this is a purely political agreement in which the church is not concerned. Miss Robertson (*Laws of the Old English Kings*, pp. 56, 114) takes *woruldfrið* to mean 'general peace' as contrasted with the local truces, but this sense of the prefix *woruld-* would be hard to parallel.

and Ælfric is strong evidence that the treaty belongs to 994 and not to 991, since the districts governed by them were all ravaged in 994, but only that of Sigeric (and Byrhtnoth) in 991.¹

This interpretation of the crucial first clause of the treaty also explains how Sigeric's name can appear in the document, even though he was probably dead before the negotiations were concluded. Olaf and Swegen had appeared before London on September 8, and after their failure to take London the coasts of Essex, Kent, Sussex and Hampshire were harried, and raids were also made inland *swa wide swa hi woldon*. It seems unlikely that these widespread raids could be carried out and peace negotiated before the end of October, and Sigeric died on October 28, or at the latest October 31, of that year.² But the treaty states only that Sigeric had purchased an earlier truce for his own district, and this he might have done in September 994; Kent and Essex would naturally be the districts attacked by the vikings immediately after their repulse from London. Thus the most specific and definite of Liebermann's difficulties, his (c) and (d), now disappear.

The amount of the tribute specified in the treaty, it will be observed, does not agree with the amount mentioned in the *Chronicle* under 991 (£10,000) or 994 (£16,000). The £22,000 stated in the treaty to have been paid to the vikings probably represents the total for 994. It is known that in 994 there were at least two payments to the vikings, one made by

¹ Such is the evidence of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, confirmed by the Scandinavian sources: see below, p. 30. There is also evidence of Sigeric's purchase of a local truce in a charter (Kemble 689) dated in its own text 995 (erroneously). It describes how Sigeric was unable to raise all the money he had promised the vikings, and they, furious at the delay in making the payment, threatened to burn his cathedral. Sigeric sent to borrow money from Bishop Æscwig of Dorchester, pledging as security land at Risborough, which another charter (Kemble 690, spurious in its present form, but probably recording a genuine transaction) returns to Sigeric's successor Ælfric. The list of witnesses in charter no. 689 is identical with that of charter 691 in Kemble, misdated in its own text 995 for 994 (on the date see Sisam, *Review of English Studies*, vii, p. 10). This list of witnesses, as appears from charter 691, belongs to a specific meeting of the *witan* in that year. Hence it is to 994 that charter 689 refers, not 991, and the scene of the bargaining is obviously Canterbury, not Southampton, where Æthelred's representatives negotiated with the vikings in 994.

² The dating of Sigeric's death in 994 is customary, but has been questioned. Two good charters bearing the date 995 (Kemble 689 and 691, mentioned above) include Sigeric in the list of witnesses. Neither of these charters are originals, but Dietrich and Plummer accepted their evidence and decided that 995 was the true date of Sigeric's death. The difficulty of accepting this date has been demonstrated by K. Sisam, *Review of English Studies*, vii, p. 10. Mr Sisam in a private communication also points out to me the importance of the entry of Sigeric's death under 994 in the Leofric Missal. 'The Leofric Missal is in this part a Glastonbury book, and Glastonbury was very closely related to Canterbury in the time of Dunstan and Sigeric, and the book itself is contemporary, as the Easter tables show. Sigeric, like Dunstan, appears to have been a Glastonbury monk. In one Easter table, the obits of four archbishops are entered, Dunstan, Æthelgar, Oswald, Sigeric. There are no other entries in this 19 years' table, and there is no difficulty of space which would force any entry out of position.' As Mr Sisam says, this evidence 'must be allowed to decide the issue'; Sigeric almost certainly died in 994.

Sigeric and described in a charter (Kemble 689), and the £16,000 paid by the king to the vikings at Southampton. There is no evidence of more than one payment in 991, and those who have ascribed the treaty text to 991 have simply left the discrepancy between the treaty's £22,000 and the *Chronicle's* £10,000 unexplained.

Liebermann's other objections to dating the treaty 994 are less weighty and can be disposed of more briefly. In answer to his objection (b) it is sufficient to say that Olaf's confirmation would naturally be the voluntary act of a man already baptized, and not a condition of the treaty, especially when Olaf's followers were still heathen. The English were in no position to make conditions about the vikings' religion.

The answer to Liebermann's objection (e) has already been given by Plummer and Liebermann himself. It is curious that the three English lords said in the treaty to have made local truces with the vikings are named by Florence of Worcester as the negotiators of the peace in 991. The explanation is probably that Florence had access to a copy of the treaty, and he took the names from it.¹ The treaty text is undated, and he had to face the same problem as modern historians and decide whether the document related to 991 or 994. Probably he thought that the three supposed negotiators of the peace acted in 991 because of the known connexion of one of them, Sigeric, with the peace arranged then. Florence has no independent authority on the campaigns in these years. He was attempting to fit together accounts from various sources, and he did not always succeed in relating them in correct chronology.

The absence of Swegen from the negotiations is readily accounted for. He had parted from Olaf and sailed away to join in the campaigns in Slesvig and Saxony in 994 and the two following years.² In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* also Swegen is not included in the negotiations of 994.

Then the Scandinavian account of Olaf's movements also has a bearing on the problem—evidence which Liebermann hardly takes into account. The Scandinavian evidence has the great advantage of being less ambiguous than the English documents, though, being recorded some centuries later, it is less reliable in matters of detail. The main outlines of Olaf's movements as described in his sagas are guaranteed, however, by the brief survey of them in the *Ólafsdrápa* composed by Hallfreðr Vandræðaskald in 996. Hallfreðr as a poet of Olaf's court would naturally be well-informed about Olaf's adventures, and he had every reason to relate them accurately, as he recited the poem to the king himself.

¹ Plummer, *Chronicle*, II, p. 173; Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, III, p. 149.

² J. C. H. R. Steenstrup, *Normannerne*, III, p. 244 f.; L. F. A. Wimmer, *De Danske Runemindermærker*, I, p. 119, or in Lis Jacobsen's *haandudgave*, pp. 97-8.

Olaf sailed from Wendland, the saga says, four years before his baptism in the Scilly Isles. The long version of the *Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar* makes a definite statement that this event, a turning-point in Olaf's life, was in the year 993. Other versions, from the relation of this event to certain fixed points of chronology, evidently intend it to be in 993 or 994. The first of the four years after leaving Wendland Olaf spent in raiding Saxony, Friesland and Flanders; then (presumably in the following year) he sailed to England. Crossing from Flanders, he would probably come first to the south-east of England, and, according to Scandinavian chronology, this would be in 990 or 991. He then sailed up the east coast of England to Northumberland, from there to Scotland and the Orkneys, then west to the Hebrides, and south to Man; then he made raids in Ireland, Wales and Cumberland. In the course of an expedition south to Brittany he visited the Scilly Isles and was there baptized. The fragments of the poem by Hallfreðr confirm this itinerary, except that they make no mention of Brittany, the Scilly Isles, or of Olaf's baptism. After this, the saga relates, he married a Dublin princess and spent his time partly in England and partly in Ireland. This account of his adventures which brings him to the shores of the Irish Sea in 993-4 must be substantially correct, supported as it is by the contemporary account in Hallfreðr's poem. It is therefore improbable that Olaf ravaged the lands of Æthelweard and Ælfric (in Wessex) in 991. In that year he must have been moving northwards along the east coast. The treaty, as we have seen, was arranged with Olaf after he had been plundering the south-west; again we see that its details do not fit the conditions of 991.¹

Of the other two viking leaders named in the treaty, Guðmund Stegitan sunu is unknown, but Iustin has been identified with Jósteinn, Olaf Tryggvason's maternal uncle. According to Scandinavian tradition, recorded in the twelfth-century Norwegian work, *Historia de Antiquitate Regum Norwagiensium*, as well as in the later Icelandic versions of *Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar*, when Olaf was in Ireland, the usurping Earl Hákon who had possession of Norway got news of him there. Hákon then sent Olaf's uncles Jósteinn and Karlshöfuð together with the treacherous Thorir Klakka to persuade Olaf to return to Norway; and they were to deliver him into Hákon's hands. The exact date of their departure is uncertain, but they could not have been with Olaf as early as 991. If, as

¹ Ælfric, in his letter to Archbishop Sigeric introducing his second series of Homilies (*Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Thorpe, II, p. 1) says that he has been much troubled by the viking raids, and, as Mr Sisam has shown (*Review of English Studies*, VII, p. 11), this was in 991, when Ælfric was at Cerne Abbas in Dorset. It is not necessary to infer that the raids which alarmed Ælfric reached his district. That which threatened Canterbury and extorted payment from Sigeric would be enough to account for his reference.

the saga relates, they first met with Olaf in Dublin, this could hardly be earlier than 993 or 994. As Æthelred's treaty is with a viking host commanded by Anlaf, Iustin and Guðmund, we have now still another reason for assigning the treaty to 994 rather than 991: Olaf and Jósteinn could not have been in the same fleet in English waters as early as 991.

Olaf Tryggvason and the Battle of Maldon

The text of Æthelred's treaty was the chief piece of evidence supporting the belief that Anlaf was the leader of the viking force at Maldon, and if the treaty really belongs to 994, the whole question becomes uncertain. It is true that in the Winchester version of the *Chronicle* 'Unlaf' is said to be the viking leader, but this annal almost certainly took the name from records belonging to 994.¹ The Scandinavian evidence shows that Olaf passed along the east coast of England about 990 or 991, but the force which destroyed Ipswich and fought at Maldon might as readily be identified with that sent out by Hákon under Jósteinn and others. There are some indications in English records which are in favour of this. Though it is generally agreed that Florence of Worcester had access to a copy of Æthelred's treaty, and thought that it belonged to 991, in his annal 991 he gives Iustin and Guthmund as the viking leaders, and leaves out the third name given in the treaty, Anlaf. Unless this is merely accidental, Florence must have had information from some other source which made it clear to him that Olaf had no part in the battle.²

The *Liber Eliensis* also names Justin and Guthmund as the viking leaders at Maldon, and makes no mention of Anlaf. It is usually assumed³ that the author of *Liber Eliensis* took these names from Florence, but there is no indication in the wording of the context that Florence was the source; and at the beginning of the chapter (Cap. 62 of Book II, p. 182 in D. J. Stewart's edition) the writer states that his source of information about Byrhtnoth and his final battle are certain *Anglicæ historiae*. These are probably stories or poems in English; Byrhtnoth was apparently still celebrated as a hero in East Anglia in the twelfth century.⁴ Many of the

¹ Above, p. 25 and footnote.

² That source may even have been the well-known poem on the battle of Maldon. Florence read and used the actual manuscript containing Asser, *Maldon* and two of Osbern's works; this later formed part of the composite manuscript volume Cotton Otho A XII, destroyed by fire in 1731. W. H. Stevenson has shown that Florence of Worcester used the Asser text in this MS. (*Asser's Life of King Alfred*, p. xlvii), and it is known that Florence used Osbern's account of Ælfeah's martyrdom. It is highly probable that he would also read the historical poem *Maldon*, standing in his manuscript between the two items which he used. We cannot be sure what he found in the Maldon text when it was complete, but it may be that Iustin and Guthmund were named there as viking leaders and not Anlaf.

³ E.g., by Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, III, p. 150.

⁴ See Liebermann, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CI, p. 26.

details given in the chapter founded on these traditions seem to be reminiscences of the account given in the Old English poem on Maldon,¹ and there is nothing that is obviously taken from written sources. Hence it is not unlikely that the names of Justin and Guthmund have descended in popular tradition from the time of the battle itself and the poem composed on it, just as the names of the viking leaders Ingvarr and Ubbi came down in oral tradition from King Eadmund's time to Abbo of Fleury and Ælfric.

Thus there is no positive evidence that Anlaf was at Maldon, and two indications that he was not. Yet it must be admitted that until the sources of Florence and the *Liber Eliensis* for their statements about the viking leaders are known with certainty, Olaf's presence at Maldon still remains a possibility. But it is no longer a probability.

E. V. GORDON.

MANCHESTER.

¹ For details see my forthcoming edition of *The Battle of Maldon*.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF MIDDLETON'S PLAYS

THE chronology of Middleton's works, many of which were published long after they were written, has always been rather confused and difficult to determine. An exception, it is true, is provided by the mayoral pageants, which are dated precisely enough; but they form the least interesting part of his work, and for present purposes may, after this reference to them, be ignored. Of far greater importance is Mr Mark Eccles's discovery that Middleton was born in 1580 and matriculated at Queen's College, Oxford, in 1598.¹ These new facts demand drastic revision of some previous speculations, and, although Mr Eccles has indicated most of the implications of his discoveries, no recent attempt has been made to extend the discussion to the whole corpus of Middleton's plays. A tentative effort to do this is therefore offered in the following pages.

Thanks to Mr Eccles, we now know that the superlatively tedious *The Wisdom of Solomon Paraphrased* (1597) is not merely Middleton's first work, but an immature schoolboy production. Similarly, *Micro-Cynicon, or Six Snarling Satires* (1599), an imitation of the 'three last books of byting satyres' of Hall's popular *Virgidemiarum* (1597), which soon after publication achieved the doubtful distinction of being burnt at the Stationers' Hall by order of the Archbishop of Canterbury,² is doubtless the product of his first undergraduate year. The poem *The Ghost of Lucrece*, though published in 1600,³ may, indeed, be earlier than the satires; extravagance and immaturity are at any rate more in evidence. *The Wisdom of Solomon Paraphrased* had a dedication which showed the seventeen-year-old boy attempting to court the favour of the Earl of Essex, though if Essex had any literary judgment at all Middleton could hardly have met with success. *The Ghost of Lucrece*, however, reveals that he had found at least a temporary patron in William, second Lord Compton, a young nobleman who afterwards became Earl of Northamp-

¹ 'Middleton's Birth and Education', *R.E.S.*, vii (1931), pp. 431 ff.

² Arber's transcript of the *Stationers' Register*, iii, pp. 677-8.

³ Unique copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library. I am indebted to the Director, Dr J. Q. Adams, for the opportunity of securing photostats and for permission to quote from the work. On the title-page and at the foot of the dedicatory sonnet the author merely appears as 'T. M.', but there is no doubt as to Middleton's authorship, since some Latin lines prefixed to the poem are headed with the (execrable) punning inscription: 'Castissimo, purissimoque Lucretiae Spiritui; Thomas Medius & Grauis Tonus primum Surge vociferat.'

ton. In a dedicatory sonnet Compton is addressed as 'godfather to th'issue of my braine' and

Baptizer of mine infant lines,
With golden water in a siluer Font:
Thy bounty, gold, thy fingers siluer twines,
Siluering my papers ink, as they were wont.

Can Compton's bounty have provided the means for Middleton's Oxford sojourn, to which he went somewhat older than most of his fellow undergraduates?

As Mr Eccles justly points out, Middleton is first heard of as a dramatist when he was working for Henslowe between May and November 1602 on various plays which have since been lost.¹ *Blurt Master Constable*, it is true, was printed in 1602 'as it hath bin sundry times acted by the Children of Paules', but it has no name on the title-page and was not, in fact, attributed to Middleton until Kirkman's list of 1661. The play can be accurately assigned to the end of 1601 or the beginning of 1602 on account of the reference at v, iii, 179² to the presence of Spanish forces in Ireland, so the date does not militate against our considering it Middleton's first play. However, his authorship of it has been questioned, and not without reason.³ Without professing to pass final judgment on the problem, one may note here that the style and manner of the play are unlike those of Middleton's other comedies in several respects: the verse is more deliberately 'poetical'; the prose is self-consciously euphuistic; and there are various attempts at local colour to emphasize the Venetian setting chosen for the play.⁴

After 19 March 1603 the London theatres were closed for over a year except for a few very brief intervals, the principal cause being the violent outbreak of the plague which occurred just after Elizabeth's death.⁵ Consequently there was little employment for the dramatists, and some of them turned to pamphleteering for their livelihood. To this period belong Middleton's two pamphlets, *The Ant and the Nightingale or Father Hubbard's Tales*, 1604 (S.R. 3 January 1603/4), and *The Blacke Booke*, 1604 (S.R. 22 March 1603/4), and Professor F. P. Wilson suggests that he may have also been concerned in the anonymous *Meeting of Gallants at an Ordinary*, 1604.⁶ However, as soon as the number of plague deaths

¹ *Diary*, ed. W. W. Greg, ff. 105^v, 106, 108, 108^v, 116^v.

² All references are to Bullen's edition of Middleton.

³ By E. H. C. Oliphant, *S.P.* xxxiii (1926), p. 166, and M. Eccles, *op. cit.*, p. 434.

⁴ E.g. the courtesans of Venice, the name *Imperia* (cf. Greene's *Black Bookes Messenger*, Bodley Head Reprints, 21) and references at ii, i, 44 and 166, iii, i, 182, v, ii, 25, etc. The scene of *The Phoenix* is also laid in Italy, but no such attempts at local colour are to be found in it.

⁵ F. P. Wilson, *The Plague in Shakespeare's London*, pp. 110-13.

⁶ *Dekker's Plague Pamphlets*, pp. xix-xx.

was abating and there was a prospect that the theatres would reopen, Middleton was back at work for Henslowe, whose *Diary* records a payment of £5 to him and Dekker at some time before 14 March 1603/4.¹ The play was printed before the end of the year.

The troubles which beset the children's companies and their masters around the years 1606-8 had the effect of releasing a number of their plays for publication. Six of Middleton's plays were published in 1607 and 1608: *The Phoenix* (S.R. 9 May 1607), *Michaelmas Term* (S.R. 15 May 1607), *A Trick to catch the Old One* (S.R. 7 October 1607), *The Family of Love* (S.R. 12 October 1607), *Your Five Gallants* (S.R. 22 March 1607/8), *A Mad World, My Masters* (S.R. 4 October 1608). Of these *The Phoenix*, *Michaelmas Term*, *A Trick to catch the Old One* and *A Mad World, My Masters* are stated on the title-pages to have belonged to the Children of Paul's, *The Family of Love* to His Majesty's Revels and *Your Five Gallants* to the Children of the Chapel. The second issue of the quarto of *A Trick to catch the Old One* states that it had also been acted at the Blackfriars (by the Children of the Chapel), and it is likely that both *The Family of Love* and *Your Five Gallants* had similarly passed from the Paul's Children to their later owners. At any rate, the texts of the two last plays suggest revision,² and it is possible that this revision was embarked on when the plays were taken over by other companies.³ One can say, then, that all these plays were written before the middle of 1606, when the Children of Paul's came to an end, and for most of them there is sufficient additional evidence to suggest a more precise date.

The Phoenix is earlier than 20 February 1604, since the title-page states that it had been performed before the king, and this date, Chambers finds,⁴ is the only one available for the performance. It is unlikely that, with the theatres still closed owing to the plague, the play had just been written then, and it probably belongs to the end of Elizabeth's reign. On

¹ F. 110. I do not believe that Middleton had any part in the *Second Part of the Honest Whore*.

² This reveals itself in the case of *The Family of Love* chiefly by the fact that certain characters have different names in different parts of the play. This feature is even more marked in *A Mad World, My Masters*, which, it may be noted, by no means ended its stage-career on publication, but when reprinted in 1640 was stated to have been 'often Acted at the Private House in Salisbury Court', and was probably revised about the same time as *The Family of Love* and *Your Five Gallants*. The text of *Your Five Gallants* is so confused that the play can scarcely have been acted in the form in which it was printed; it seems to show the play midway in process of revision. I hope shortly to publish a full study of this very interesting text.

³ Middleton is known to have been working for the Children of the Revels (who took over *The Family of Love*) as early as May 1606, when he was writing for them a lost play, *The Viper's Brood*. See H. N. Hillebrand, 'Thomas Middleton's "The Viper's Brood"', *M.L.N.* XLII (Jan. 1927), pp. 35-8.

⁴ *Elizabethan Stage*, III, p. 439; IV, p. 118.

grounds of style, too, I should be inclined to fix as early a date as possible for it. The year 1602 is therefore the most likely date.

When *The Family of Love* was published in 1608 it was prefaced by an epistle *To the Reader* in which the author says that it was published

too late, for that it was not published when the general voice of the people had sealed it for good, and the newness of it made it much more desired than at this time; for plays in this city are like wenches new fallen to the trade, only desired of your neatest gallants whiles they're fresh; when they grow stale they must be vented by termers and country chapmen.

The play, then, was by this time several years old. Furthermore, at i, iii, 101-13 there is a reference to a play on the subject of Samson, which may be reasonably identified with the play of that name for which Henslowe paid £6 on behalf of the Admiral's Men on 29 July 1602.¹ As such an allusion would have the more point the closer it came to the earliest performances of the play referred to, we are probably justified in assigning *The Family of Love* to the second half of 1602, or at least to some period before the Queen's death and the plague closed the theatres.

There is a passage in *Michaelmas Term* at ii, iii, 226-9 which contains a significant allusion:

Why stand I here (as late our graceless dames,
That found no eyes), to see the gentleman
Alive, in state and credit, executed,
Help to rip up himself, does all he can?

Dyce considered this a reference to the execution of Sir Everard Digby on 30 January 1606 for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, and in this he has been followed by Bullen and Chambers. Fleay, however (*Biog. Chron.*), saw a reference to the execution of Francis Clarke on 29 November 1603 at Winchester, to which the term had been removed on account of the plague, and in this case, it would appear, Fleay is right. The description of Clarke's execution in Howes' continuation of Stow's *Annals*² is given from a letter written by an eyewitness, and this letter was written by 'T. M.' Mr Eccles has shown that Stow introduced Buc's account of the 1596 attack on Cadiz into the *Annals*;³ Howes may just as easily have introduced into the *Continuation* information which Middleton supplied. That Middleton was interested in such matters we need not doubt, especially in view of the fact that he afterwards sought and conscientiously filled the office of Chronologer to the City of London. It is thus likely that Middleton had been in Winchester and had witnessed Clarke's execution in November 1603, and there is a further reference in *A Mad*

¹ F. 107.

² Ed. 1615, pp. 828-32.

³ 'Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels' in *Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans*, at pp. 429-31.

World, My Masters which seems to supply confirmatory evidence and to link it with the same period. At iv, iii, 102-7 Sir Bounteous Progress, complaining of the theft of his jewels, exclaims:

But say I should complain; perhaps she has pawned 'em—'Sfoot, the judges will but laugh at it and bid her borrow more money of 'em; make the old fellow pay for's lechery; that's all the mends I get. I have seen the same case tried at Newbury at the last 'sizes.

Newbury and Winchester are not far apart, and the two allusions seem to suggest that Middleton visited the two towns to escape the plague then raging in London. Of the two plays, *A Mad World, My Masters* is perhaps the earlier, but both would seem to have been written before the middle of 1604.

Of the two remaining plays in this group not much can be said. Chambers is in favour of the date 1607 for *Your Five Gallants*¹ on account of references to closure because of the plague and to fighting with a windmill (like Don Quixote). But the plague references would fit more dates than 1607, as F. P. Wilson's *The Plague in Shakespeare's London*, pp. 114-19, 186, shows, and, if my theory of a revision is tenable, the reference to Don Quixote might well have been a later insertion. There is nothing in *A Trick to catch the Old One* to connect the play with any specific date prior to the middle of 1606.

This is perhaps as much as can be done to determine the order of Middleton's early plays, and, in view of the uncertainty of the order of those which may be presumed to come next, it will be preferable to pass on before discussing them to the other end of Middleton's career, of which one can speak with more certainty than of any other period. Three plays were licensed for performance by Sir Henry Herbert: *The Changeling* and *The Spanish Gipsy* for the Lady Elizabeth's Men on 7 May 1622 and 9 July 1623 respectively; and *A Game at Chess* for the King's Men on 12 June 1624.² The rest of the plays seem to fall into the intervening period, 1606-22, and only a few of them can be dated more exactly with any approach to confidence.

The Roaring Girl was printed in 1611 as lately 'Acted on the Fortune-stage by the Prince his Players', and is possibly the 'book concerninge Mall Cutpurse' entered S.R. by Ambrose Garland on 18 February 1611/12. Chambers has printed an extract from the *Consistory of London Correction Book* for the year 1605,³ which shows that Mary Frith then confessed

¹ *Elizabethan Stage*, III, p. 440.

² These records from Herbert's Office-Book have been preserved as manuscript notes in Malone's copies of the quartos of these plays in the Bodleian. They are printed by W. J. Lawrence, 'New Facts from Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book', *T.L.S.*, 29 Nov. 1923, and F. P. Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', 4 *Library*, VII, p. 209.

³ 'Elizabethan Stage Gleanings', *R.E.S.* I (1925), pp. 77-8.

before the Court that 'being at a play about three quarters of a year since at the Fortune in mans apparel' she had uttered various 'immodest and lascivious speeches. . . and also sat upon the stage in the public viewe of all the people there present in mans apparel and played upon her lute and sange a song'. This occasion may actually have been the one promised in the epilogue to the play:

The Roaring Girl herself, some few days hence,
Shall on this stage give larger recompence.

On the other hand, she may easily have been a fairly frequent member of the audience, who sat on a stool on the stage, and occasionally treated the audience to an unscheduled turn. In any case, another date for the play is possible. To begin with, there is a very close relationship between v, i of the play and Dekker's *Belman of London* (entered S.R. 14 March 1607/8). A comparison of v, i, 133-8 and 290-306 with the corresponding portions of the pamphlet¹ will show how close the relationship is—so close, in fact, as to suggest that Dekker was working on the play and the pamphlet at about the same time.² Another clue suggesting the same period is to be found at i, i, 254-5, where Moll is described as follows:

Nay, more, let this strange thing walk, stand, or sit,
No blazing star draws more eyes after it.

The reference to the 'blazing star' may well be to Halley's comet, which reached its perihelion towards the end of November 1607, and must have been visible while Dekker was writing *The Belman of London*.

There is a passage in the epilogue to *The Roaring Girl* which has never been satisfactorily explained:

Some for the person will revile the scene,
And wonder, that a creature of her being
Should be the subject of a poet, seeing
In the world's eye, none weighs so light: others look
For all those base tricks publish'd in a book,
(Foul as his brains they flow'd from) of outpurse[s],
Of nips and foists, nasty, obscene discourses,
As full of lies, as empty of worth or wit,
For any honest ear, or eye unfit.

However, if one accepts the relationship between the play and *The Belman* it becomes possible to do so. Dekker's *Lanthorne and Candlelight* (S.R. 25 October 1608) is a sequel to *The Belman*, and in its opening address 'To my own Nation' contains an attack on 'an Usurper' who 'will be

¹ Ed. Oliphant Smeaton, Temple Classics, pp. 99-100, 132, 145. It is true that the passage on p. 145 is taken almost *verbatim* from Greene's *Second Part of Conny-catching*; but Greene speaks only of the 'snap' and of 'smoking', while Dekker adds the terms 'cloyer' and 'boiling', which appear as alternatives both in the pamphlet and in the play.

² Another example of Dekker's use of the same material twice over within a brief period has recently been pointed out. See W. J. Paylor, 'Thomas Dekker and the "Overburian" Characters', *M.L.R.* xxxi (1936), pp. 155 ff.

taken for a Beadle of Bridewell'. This certainly refers to S.R., the author of *Martin Mark-All Beadle of Bridewell. His defence and Answer to the Belman of London*¹ (entered S.R. 31 March 1610), who in this pamphlet writes scathingly of Dekker's incompetence to deal with his subject. No Martin Mark-All pamphlet earlier than 1610 has survived, but Dekker's remarks in *Lanthorne and Candlelight* make it clear that one had appeared soon after *The Belman* was published, and it is this book, one would suggest, that is also referred to in the epilogue to *The Roaring Girl*. The prologue to the play tells us that it had been 'expected long', so that, if it was written at about the same time as *The Belman*, viz. in the winter of 1607/8, its production might easily have been delayed long enough for the authors to notice Martin Mark-All's earlier (and now lost) strictures in the epilogue.

In passing on to the remaining plays one should note that they all reveal a maturity of style not characteristic of the early group, and much nearer to that of the plays licensed by Sir Henry Herbert. There is hardly space here to analyse it in detail, but its characteristics have been admirably summarised by Mr E. H. C. Oliphant,² who adds, forcibly but justly, that 'there is no dramatist of the period in whom there is a more marked difference between the early conventional imitative manner and the later style, deliberate and individual, than Middleton'.³

In tone and technique *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* approaches most nearly to the early group of city comedies, and is perhaps the earliest of the group now being considered. Fortunately, it can be dated with some approach to certainty. The title-page of the quarto of 1630 states that it had been 'acted at the Swan on the Banke-side by the Lady Elizabeth her Seruants', and it has been shown that this company could only have been at the Swan between 1611 and 1613.⁴ Further information is supplied by the references to the keeping of Lent in II, i and II, ii, especially by Touchwood senior's speech at II, i, 105-13:

What shift she'll make now with this piece of flesh
In this strict time of Lent, I cannot imagine;
Flesh dare not peep abroad...

¹ This pamphlet is reprinted in the Hunterian Club's edition of the Works of Samuel Rowland, but the author was more probably Samuel Rid. See F. Aydelotte, *Elizabethan Rogues and Vagabonds*, pp. 134-6.

² *The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, pp. 83-5.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁴ C. W. Wallace, 'The Swan Theatre and the Earl of Pembroke's Servants', *Eng. Stud.* XLII, at pp. 390-1, and E. K. Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, II, pp. 257-8. Chambers, III, p. 441, follows Fleay in identifying the play with *The Proud Maid's Tragedy*, performed at Court by the Lady Elizabeth's Men on 25 February 1612, but the play is not a tragedy, and there is no proud maid in it.

There have been more religious wholesome laws
 In this half-circle of a year erected
 For the common good than memory ne'er knew of.¹

The observance of Lent was regulated by the Privy Council, which issued its orders on the subject annually. The proclamations show that in 1608 the old regulations of Elizabeth's time were made more stringent, that the 1608 proclamations were reissued annually until even greater strictness for 1614 was enjoined by an order of 12 November 1613.² However, this strictness seems to have begun earlier than the surviving proclamations suggest, for amongst the *Remembrancia* of the City of London there is a letter from the Privy Council dated 9 February 1612-13 on the subject:

So great hath bene the abuse and contempte of those Orders and direçons which . . . in former years have bene published for the orderlie keeping of Lent. . . as his Maiestie is now inforced. . . to resolve more absolutelie to prohibite the killinge or utteringe of flesh, by any Butcher or other person in the cittie of London. . . during Lent. . . . And therefore hath caused certen newe Orders to be Imprinted and published for that purpose.

The Lord Mayor is asked to enforce the orders, but the Privy Council also took its own measures, as is clear from a letter written by the Lord Mayor a few weeks later, protesting that the Council had granted a warrant to a messenger to search out offending butchers and bring them before it, instead of addressing letters and warrants to the Lord Mayor, as the privileges of the City demanded. This evidence suggests that the references in the play are to the enforcement of the orders of 1613, and that the play was acted shortly after Lent in that year, at a time when the Swan was still regularly occupied.

A Fair Quarrel, the first surviving play in which Middleton collaborated with Rowley, was printed in 1617, and another issue 'with new Additions' came out in the same year. The play was acted by the Prince's Men, to whom Rowley belonged. It is probable that the temporary amalgamation under Henslowe in April 1614 of the Lady Elizabeth's Men (for whom Middleton had written *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*) with Prince Charles's Men first brought the two dramatists into close contact, and *A Fair Quarrel* would thus have been written between 1614 and 1617. The printing of the quarto, and the inclusion of the 'new Additions' shortly afterwards, suggest a recent revival of a play that had been popular during the previous season, and one may assign it to either of the years 1615 and 1616.

¹ Fleay (*Biog. Chron.*) says that this is an allusion 'to the statutes of 1610', but what he is referring to I am at a loss to know.

² R. Steele, *Catalogue of Tudor and Stuart Proclamations*, nos. 1055 and 1137.

Several other plays most probably belong to these years, although Middleton seems to have transferred his allegiance from the Prince's to the King's Men for a time. At any rate, of the plays next to be considered, *More Dissemblers besides Women*, *The Witch*, *The Widow*, *The Mayor of Queenborough* and *Anything for a Quiet Life* were all King's Men's plays. There is no indication for whom *No Wit, No Help, like a Woman's* and *Women Beware Women* were written, but *The Old Law* and *The World Tossed at Tennis* were written in conjunction with Rowley for his company. For the dates of *More Dissemblers* and *No Wit, No Help* there is practically no evidence; the former was revived as an old play, previously licensed by Sir George Buc, in October 1623, and Malone believed that it was originally written 'c. 1615'.¹ This date will do as well as any until further evidence comes to hand, and one is inclined to assign *No Wit, No Help*, from its general similarity of technique, to a date fairly close to it, but that is all that is possible.

The Witch has survived in a manuscript transcribed by the scribe Ralph Crane some time between 1620 and 1627, but the preliminary epistle by Middleton states that 'this (ignorantly-ill-fated) Labour of mine' had lain 'long in an imprisond-Obscuritie'.² Obviously it had been a failure on the stage, and had not been acted for several years when the transcription was made. In Sebastian's scheme to prevent Antonio from consummating his marriage with Isabella, and in the charms he seeks from the witches to effect his purpose, there is a clear allusion to the notorious Essex divorce case of 1613, but the play is more likely to date from about 1616, as the parts played by Simon Forman and Mrs Turner in aiding the Countess of Essex were not disclosed until the Overbury murder trials at the end of 1615. The allusion to the 'hatefull yellow bands' (which Mrs Turner wore at her execution) at v, i, 52-3 of *The Widow* suggests that it belongs to a date close to that of *The Witch*. It has been suggested that *The Widow* was originally written in 1607 or 1608-9,³ and revised about 1616, but these suggestions seem to me to be unnecessary, since the style and versification are throughout those of the mature Middleton.

The Old Law has until recently been held to have had its origin in 1599, at the very beginning of Middleton's career, mainly on account of the statement at III, i, 34 that 'tis now ninety-nine'. But it must be

¹ W. J. Lawrence, *op. cit.*

² See F. P. Wilson, 'Ralph Crane, Scrivener to the King's Players', 4 *Library*, VII (1926-7), p. 208.

³ By W. J. Lawrence, quoted in E. H. C. Oliphant, *Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, pp. 492-8, and Bullen, *Introduction*, p. lxxxvii.

recognized that such dates put into the mouths of characters have a dramatic significance only. In *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside* at iv, i, 253-4 Yellowhammer says that he

had a bastard
By Mistress Anne, in anno...

and the blank has been left for the actor to insert any convenient date. Still more interesting is a passage in Heywood's *Captives* (B.M., MS. Eg. 1994). This play was licensed by Herbert on 3 September 1624; it contains a scene in which the father discovers his long-lost daughter, and anticipates the date of her birth in an inscription that is being read aloud by exclaiming the year '1530'.¹ In the manuscript '1530' is written over '1600'; Heywood originally thought of the events as more or less contemporary (though the girl of the play is more likely to be sixteen or eighteen years old than twenty-four), and then deliberately set back the date of the events of the play to the previous century. The events of *The Old Law* (even though the scene is ancient Greece!) may quite easily have been antedated in the same way. In any case, Mr Eccles's discoveries preclude a date as early as 1599. E. C. Morris, accepting the earlier date, suggested that the original play was revised by Rowley in 1616 for a Court performance,² and this may well have been the date when it was first written by the two writers in collaboration. That a Court performance was given or contemplated about 1619 is now known from the appearance of the play in one of the lists pasted into Sir George Buc's manuscript *History of Richard III*.

The remaining plays need not detain us long. *The World Tossed at Tennis* was probably acted before the Prince of Wales at Somerset House on 4 March 1619/20.³ *The Mayor of Queenborough*, which figures in another of Buc's Revels Office scraps, belongs to the second half of the second decade of the century,⁴ and Mr F. L. Lucas has shown that *Anything for a Quiet Life* was written in or shortly after 1621.⁵ *Women Beware Women*, a play revealing tragic powers with strong affinities to those displayed in *The Changeling*, was probably written very shortly before 1622, when Sir Henry Herbert's records begin.⁶

¹ Ed. A. C. Judson, v, iv, 296-305.

² 'The Date and Composition of "The Old Law"', *P.M.L.A.*, xvii (1902), pp. 1 ff.

³ See W. J. Lawrence, 'Early Substantive Theatre Masques', *T.L.S.*, 8 Dec. 1921.

⁴ I hope to discuss the problems involved in the dating of this play in a forthcoming edition of it.

⁵ *Works of John Webster*, iv, p. 65.

⁶ I am aware that Mr E. H. C. Oliphant, *Shakespeare and his Fellow Dramatists*, II, p. 948, is of the opinion that this play belongs to the very end of Middleton's career, and was written just before his death in 1627. As he points out, the English translation of the source, *The Tragick Loves of Hippolyto and Isabella*, was not entered S.R. until 9 November 1627, after Middleton's death; but it had been available in French, as *Les amours tragiques*

In the present state of our knowledge I would suggest the following order and dates for Middleton's plays:

[<i>Blurt Master Constable</i>	1601-2]
<i>The Phoenix</i>	1602
<i>The Family of Love</i>	1602 (revised 1606 or 7)
<i>The Honest Whore, I</i>	1604
<i>A Mad World, My Masters</i>	1604 (revised 1606 or 7)
<i>Michaelmas Term</i>	1604
<i>Your Five Gallants</i>	1605 (revised 1607)
<i>A Trick to catch the Old One</i>	c. 1606
<i>The Roaring Girl</i>	1607-8
<i>A Chaste Maid in Cheapside</i>	1613
<i>More Dissemblers besides Women</i>	c. 1615
<i>No Wit, No Help, like a Woman's</i>	c. 1615
<i>A Fair Quarrel</i>	1615-16
<i>The Witch</i>	1616
<i>The Widow</i>	1616
<i>The Old Law</i>	c. 1616
<i>The Mayor of Queenborough</i>	1615-20
<i>The World Tossed at Tennis</i>	1619
<i>Anything for a Quiet Life</i>	1621
<i>Women Beware Women</i>	c. 1621
<i>The Changeling</i>	1622
<i>The Spanish Gypsy</i>	1623
<i>A Game at Chess</i>	1624

Future investigation will undoubtedly modify these conjectures, and it is fairly obvious that the mass of plays which I have grouped around the years 1615 and 1616 should be spread out over a longer period. In the absence of sufficient evidence to do this accurately, it seems wiser to leave the list as it stands. The list also reveals a lacuna in Middleton's dramatic activities between 1608 and 1613 which previous scholars, abhorring a vacuum, have tried to fill in conjecturally by assigning to these years such plays as *The Widow*, *The Old Law*, and *The Mayor of Queenborough*. There is, however, no necessity to do so. All one can say is that Middleton's dramatic activities were pretty certainly more extensive than the official canon of his work suggests, and even though one adds to it such plays as *The Puritan*, *The Revenger's Tragedy*, and a share in the Beaumont and Fletcher corpus, to mention but a few attributions, much of his work has undoubtedly perished.

R. C. BALD.

STELLENBOSCH.

d'Hypolite et Isabelle, since 1610 (see Franklin P. Rolfe, 'On the Bibliography of Seventeenth-Century Prose Fiction', *P.M.L.A.*, XLIX (1934), pp. 1071 ff. at p. 1079), and I cannot help believing that if the play had been mentioned in Herbert's Office-Book, as it would have been if it had belonged to the later date, Malone would have preserved some record of the fact.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF SPANISH BALLAD ORIGINS

IF, after half a century of debate, the origins of Spanish balladry remain the most complex and obscure problem of Spanish literary history, it is largely because the issue has turned chiefly on the relation of ballad to epic and the history of the latter is itself in debate. We possess one Spanish epic, in a late and incomplete copy, one or two fragments whose exact filiation is open to question, several tentative reconstructions from prose texts, a number of postulated titles, and no exact dates. The nature and process of the final eclipse of the epic, although corresponding to a period of considerable literary activity, are doubtfully more clear to us than the nature and process of its emergence. To raise a structure of hypothesis on foundations in themselves hypothetical is not a procedure that normally commands critical assent, and the measure of acceptance—greater within than without Spain—that is still accorded to the traditional theory concerning the *romancero* corresponds to the paucity of exact data on the subject. The obligation devolving on the critic to check theory at every step by such data as we do possess is the greater in consequence.

The object of the present essay is to approach the problem from a consideration that, if not new, has not to our knowledge been stressed in this connexion, to wit, the possibility of epic survivals reaching well into the mid-fifteenth century. On the strength of the familiar passage in Santillana's *Prohemio*, c. 1449: 'Infimos son aquellos que sin ningun orden, regla, nin cuento fazen estos romances e cantares de que las gentes de baxa e servil condicon se alegran', Menéndez Pelayo and others of a past generation, interpreting 'cantares' as epics, assumed as much, although they were not concerned to substantiate it.¹ Sr Menéndez Pidal also makes the assertion: 'Las gestas o grandes poemas se dejaron de escribir en la segunda mitad del siglo quince', but again as a casual statement, and without proof or inference.² As our greatest authority on epic and chronicle, however, enough evidence is to be found scattered through his pages, and little is needed to establish a reasonable certainty

¹ Wolf, *Studien zur Geschichte der span. und portug. Nationalliteratur*, pp. 416 ff.; Lidforss, *Los Cantares de myo Cid*, p. 102; Menéndez Pelayo, *Antología de líricos*, xi, p. 95.

² *Poesía juglaresca y juglares* (1924), p. 415.

of such survival. While the *Crónica Rimada del Cid*¹ is placed, at latest, in the opening years of the century, and we have no record of any later epic composition, it would to begin with be almost as rash to assume this to be the last as it has proved to be to assume that the *Cantar de Mio Cid* was the first. Mortality was high among epics, and as the kind descended in the esteem of the noble and literate classes it was likely to mount higher. As in the earlier period, evidence is to be looked for chiefly in the chronicles, and Sr Menéndez Pidal provides two data almost coincident with the time of composition of the *Prohemio*.² They concern the *Cantar de los Infantes de Salas*. In an *arreglo* of the *Crónica de 1344*, compiled in Toledo c. 1440, are to be found passages deriving, according to the Spanish scholar, from a *refundición* of the *Segundo Cantar* in which the versification of several scenes has been recast with different assonants.³ And the same *Segundo Cantar* was in part incorporated in the *Tercera Crónica General* at a date that Sr Menéndez Pidal fixes approximately at the middle of the century, 'caso curiosísimo de prosificación ligera o tenue, que conserva hasta la *e* paragógica de los versos'. Derivative versions of the early epics, and possibly primitive versions as well, were therefore still current towards 1450.

And if the epic, presumably the *juglar*. In his now humble capacity literature and the records of noble houses will take scant note of him, but one figure is known to us, largely from the scornful verses of personal enemies and disdainful patrons, who seems indicated for the rôle. Juan Poeta, or Juan de Valladolid, son of an old-clothes vendor and of a tavern wench, lived from the beginning of the century till after 1477, and the strange vicissitudes of his life have been evoked by Professor E. Levi⁴ and Sr Menéndez Pidal,⁵ although they do not claim him in this connexion. 'Aunque no se le llama juglar (este nombre se había anticuado mucho) es enteramente semejante a los juglares cortesanos de la antigua

¹ This some have looked upon as less an epic composition than an attempt to produce a verse chronicle, but alike subject matter and verse form are epic, the handling of the theme illustrates a known tendency in epic development, and the definite connexion between it and three of the *Cid* ballads makes it a corner stone of the disintegration theory. It may not be demonstrable, as Sr Menéndez Pidal assumes (*L'Épopée Castillane*, p. 141), that it was ever recited by *juglares*, but unless these ballads are erudite compositions it must have exercised some form of popular appeal.

² *Poesía juglaresca*, pp. 404-5.

³ The change of assonance may instead go back to the lost *Primer Cantar*. It is well known, thanks to the same scholar, that 'las crónicas derivadas son a veces más fieles a las fuentes primitivas que la Primera Crónica, de la cual todas derivan' (*Cantar de Mio Cid*, I, p. 126). For confirmation see J. Puyol y Alonso, *El Cantar de Gesta de don Sancho II de Castilla* (1911), pp. 13-14. Such persistence of transmission warns us against assuming lack of record to mean non-existence.

⁴ 'Un juglar español en Sicilia', in *Motivos Hispánicos* (Florence, 1933).

⁵ *Poesía juglaresca*, pp. 422-6 and 476-8.

lirica gallega o provenzal, cuando le vemos vagar incansable de uno en otro palacio, siempre escarnecido por los poetas a causa de los dones que recibe y a causa de entremeterse a trovar, siendo de condición inferior', says the latter. It is doubtless the general trend of his argument that leads the Spanish scholar at once to call Juan Poeta a 'tipo vagabundo de juglar de romances' and to relate him to 'la antigua lirica gallega o provenzal', for which the evidence would seem rather to substitute 'la antigua epopeya castellana'. Menéndez Pelayo had already suggested as much, noting that a contemporary had in fact applied to him precisely this term *juglar*: 'Juan de Valladolid debía conservar ciertos hábitos de rapsoda o juglar épico, pues que su encarnizado enemigo (Antón de Montoro) añade que su arte era:

de ciego juglar
que canta viejas hazañas.¹

'Viejas hazañas' were never, it may be believed, cultivated by the Provençal and Galician lyric, whose inspiration was essentially contemporary and subjective; they were, on the contrary, the stock-in-trade of the epic *juglar*. 'Relicario de las invenciones buenas', Antón de Montoro further calls his enemy.

Juan Poeta's early manhood was passed in Sicily. His office, attached to the Customs in Palermo, was located close by the famous *Steri* of the Claramonte family, the ceilings of which had been adorned about 1380 with paintings based on medieval epic themes. Half a century later part of the ceiling had to be replaced and new paintings on similar themes were called for. Among the artists commissioned to supply them the name of Juan de Valladolid appears on three occasions, in 1426, in 1430 and again in 1438. His familiarity with early heroic poetry is thus doubly attested. He is not yet accredited as an itinerant epic *juglar*, but evidence of the persistence of this calling till much later may be adduced from another quarter. 'Como de introducción reciente se denuncia en Nápoles en 1471 la presencia del cantastorie venido del Norte. Sobre su banca o escabel canta en largas sesiones, durante dos días seguidos, un poema de empresas guerreras y desafíos.'² There is no possibility here of confusion with early lyric or nascent ballad; this is an authentic epic minstrel, whose repertory might well have included versions of the *Chanson de Roland* or of the *Mio Cid*. And among his listeners may well have been Juan Poeta himself, whom we know to have been in Naples from some time after the middle of 1470 till 1473.

¹ *Antología de líricos*, v, p. 303. See *Cancionero de Antón de Montoro*, ed. Cotarelo (1900), p. 277.

² Menéndez Pidal, *Poesía juglaresca*, p. 427.

In Spain his gifts as an itinerant hawker of traditional themes—'trobas de almacén, forjadas de fierro viejo', Gómez Manrique calls them¹—were exercised from some time after 1444, the last year of his stay in Palermo, till 1458, in 1470, and again from 1477.

'Con un solo cantar
cala todas las Españas'²

is the last and most significant thrust of Antón de Montoro, to whom our vagrant, in spite of his ambition to figure in the courtly lyric of the new age, is but a mean survival of the heroic tradition of the previous three centuries. We have this reason to be grateful for the ambition, that it has preserved his name and activities from oblivion. The supposition seems reasonable that others, lacking his ambition, shared his activities down the fifteenth century and kept alive among 'las gentes de baxa e servil condición' the memory of those earlier epic themes.

Should so much be granted, or be established by the discovery of fresh evidence, several conclusions of interest for the origins and early history of the *romancero* would appear to follow. Sr Menéndez Pidal still holds to the traditional contention, argued persuasively and with unbending conviction, that the ballad in Spain originated as a disintegration of the epic: 'Estos romances derivados de las gestas son no sólo la porción más antigua, sino también la más original del Romancero.'³ The claim of greatest originality for a derivative group need not concern us here, but that this group is the oldest appears to follow rather from his theory than from documentation. It will be pertinent to recall the ballads to which an early date can be assigned with some conviction. The theory of contemporaneity, that as held by Durán would place the Rodrigo ballads in the eighth century, is now generally granted a broad validity for the rigorously historical, and especially the frontier, ballads, which repeatedly pass over resounding happenings to fasten on minor incidents that, were they not recorded straightway by participant or witness, would have left no memory. We have evidence of the composition of such a ballad in the *Crónica del Condestable*, where we read of Enrique IV in 1462 that 'por tan grande fue tenido este fecho (a frontier raid), según dice el cronista, que el rey nuestro señor, porque mayor memoria quedase, mandó facer

¹ *Cancionero de Gómez Manrique*, ed. Paz y Melia (1886), II, p. 155.

² Sr Menéndez Pidal, *loc. cit.*, and H. R. Lang, 'Notes on the Metre of the Poem of the Cid' (*Romance Review*, V (1914), p. 314) both adduce this passage as showing 'cantar' to be then equivalent to *romance*. This is not proven, and the probabilities must remain against it. The itinerant *jugar* with his repertory of a single epic is a recognizable figure in a now despised tradition. To represent Juan Poeta as peddling the country with a single ballad is incompatible with Antón de Montoro's attribution to him immediately before of a well-stocked memory.

³ *El Romancero Español* (1910), p. 16.

un romance, el cual a los cantores de su capilla mandó asonar'.¹ On this ground the 'Romance del Cerco de Baeza' is given the date 1368, and is accorded pride of place as the earliest ballad of known date. A half-dozen others dealing specifically with Pedro the Cruel had likewise, in virtue of their topical pertinence, been placed in the fourteenth century. Professor W. J. Entwistle has now supplied proof in the demonstration that López de Ayala prosifies two on Doña Blanca's death in his *Crónica del Rey Don Pedro*, completed at latest in 1407.² In the early fifteenth century the new fervour of the Reconquest gives many exact dates. There are ballads describing battles, forays and sieges of 1407, 1410, 1424, 1431, and many more. The evidence for these dates of composition must remain, it is true, mainly circumstantial in many cases—the 'Cerco de Baeza' ballad we do not find printed or mentioned till over two centuries after the event—but no reasonable consideration has yet, we think, been advanced for rejecting it. Another ballad with a historical, but not a frontier, setting, that on the Carvajal brothers, 'Válasme, Nuestra Señora', is in a somewhat different category. The imaginative treatment and more than local interest of the theme, added to other considerations to which we shall return, do not here demand belief in the date of composition being that of the event, 1312, and all we have is a date *ante quem*, 1444, if we allow Juan de Mena's reference in *Las Trescientas* to Fernando IV:

'del qual se dize morir emplazado
de los que de Martos ovo despeñado
segun dicen rusticos deste cantando.'³

Within another group, that of the lyrical ballads, which are perhaps those least susceptible to the fixing of dates, documentary evidence of considerable value and interest has recently come to light. A Florentine MS. of 1421, written by the Catalan Jaume de Olesa, includes a ballad the significance of which for the early *romancero*, well brought out by its discoverer and editor, Professor Levi,⁴ is such that it may be quoted here in its entirety.

—'Gentil dona, gentil dona,
dona de bell parasser,
los pes tingo en la verdura
esperando este plaser.'
Por hi passa l'escudero
mesurado 7 cortes,
las paraulas que me dixo
todes eren demores:

¹ Quoted in Menéndez Pidal, *Poesía juglaresca*, p. 421. The ballad is missing in all the MSS.

² 'The *Romancero del Rey don Pedro* in Ayala and the *Cuarta Crónica General*' (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxv (1930)).

³ Quoted in Menéndez Pidal, *Poesía juglaresca*, p. 417.

⁴ 'El romance florentino de Jaume de Olesa' (*Revista de Filología Española*, xiv (1927)). Reprinted in *Motivos Hispánicos*.

—‘Chata, escudero, este coeppo,
 este coeppo a tu plaser,
 les titilles agudilles
 qu’el brial queran fender.’
 Allí dixo l’escudero:
 —‘No es hora de tender;
 la muller tingo fermosa,
 figes he de mantener.
 Al ganado en la cierra,
 que se me ua a perder,
 els perros en les cadenes
 que no tienen que comer.’
 —‘Alla vages, mal villano,
 Dieus te quera mal feses,
 por hun poco de mal ganado
 dexes coeppo de plaser.’

In this ballad can be seen, distorted, like the language, in reminiscence, the prototype of the famous ‘Romance de una gentil dama y un rústico pastor’,¹ versions of which are current not only throughout Spain but among Jewish communities in the Balkans and the Near East and in parts of America as far distant as Santiago de Chile and California. It is to be noted, however, that here, as also in the version found in the Balkans, which bears out the known archaizing, conservative tendency of literary tradition among the exiled Jews, the ‘pastor’ is an ‘escudero’, which with the initial quartet transports us at once to the atmosphere of the Provençal or Galician love-lyric, the *cantigas de amigo*. Moreover, Jaume de Olesa, who is clearly not the author of the ballad, allows memories of two other lyrical ballads to creep into his transcription. Not only is the introduction,

Gentil dona, gentil dona,
 dona de bell parasser...

clearly akin to those of

Fonte frida, fonte frida,
 fonte frida y con amor...

and

Rosa fresca, rosa fresca,
 tan garrida y con amor...

but

las paraulas que me dixo
 todes eran demores...

is clearly an echo of

las palabras que le dixo
 todas eran de traición...

in the former, as

la muller tingo fermosa,
 figes he de mantener...

appears to go back to the

que tenéis mujer hermosa
 y hijos como una flor...

¹ No. 145 of the *Primavera y Flor de Romances*.

of the latter. That the influence is not in the other direction follows on considerations of pertinence in the respective settings. Let it be noted, finally, with reference to another vexed question,¹ that 'Gentil dona, gentil dona' is indubitably written in quatrains. This ballad, in a MS. of 1421, is the oldest document we possess in the whole history of the *romancero*. 'De cuantas reliquias se han descubierto del primitivo romancero español modernamente', remarks Sr Menéndez Pidal,² 'es [ésta] la más importante, la más llena de revelaciones sobre la más antigua historia de este género de poesía tradicional', although we are not aware that he has as yet applied the conclusions to be drawn from it to his own theory.

Here then are three lyrical ballads, 'Rosa fresca', 'Fonte frida', 'Gentil dona', whose existence is attested before 1421. To them may be added, still in the first half of the century, the two by Carvajales in the *Cancionero de Stúñiga*, 'Retrayda estaba la reyna' and 'Terrible duelo fasía', and, if we admit Sr P. Rajna's contention,³ reasonable at least in so far as Carvajales, a court poet, was obviously following popular models, the two on which these were based, 'Retrayda está la infanta' and 'Triste estaba el caballero'. There are further the three ballads, 'Quien huviese tal ventura', 'De Francia partió la niña', and 'En Castilla está un castillo', versions of which are attributed to the Galician troubadour Juan Rodríguez del Padrón, who died c. 1450, in a MS. of some fifty years later.⁴ The 'romances de don Bueso' referred to by Juan Alvarez Gato, c. 1455, as something old and demoded,⁵ must also, if they are to be allowed any evidential value, appear in this category and be related to the *Kudrun* theme of ancient German epic that, giving rise to lyrical ballads, entered Spain, as it appears, from France early in the fifteenth century.⁶

¹ S. G. Morley, 'Are the Spanish Romances written in Quatrains?' (*Romanic Review*, vii (1916)); G. Cirot, 'Le mouvement quaternaire dans les romances' (*Bulletin Hispanique*, xxi (1919)).

² In Foreword to *Motivos Hispánicos*.

³ Osservazioni e dubbi concernenti la storia delle romanze spagnuole' (*Romanic Review*, vi (1915), pp. 20-2).

⁴ 'Lieder des Juan Rodríguez del Padrón nach der Handschrift der Brit. Mus.', ed. Rennert (*Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, 1893).

⁵ 'Por lindas canciones nuevas los romances de don Bueso.'

Cancionero inédito de Juan Alvarez Gato (1901), p. 16. See Menéndez Pelayo, *Antología de líricos*, x, pp. 58-9, and Lang, *Romanic Review*, v (1914), pp. 321, 346-9.

⁶ See Menéndez Pidal, 'Supervivencia del poema de Kudrun' (*Revista de Filología Española*, xx (1933)). The author places the first diffusion of the group between 1450 and 1480 (p. 37), dismissing rather cryptically the Alvarez Gato allusion to don Bueso as to a different person 'sin duda más famoso entonces, aunque hoy nos es desconocido'. Professor Lang, although aware that the three cycles of don Bueso ballads of later tradition are all novelistic and lyrical, opted for the obscure Bueso of the *Primera Crónica General*, 'que so primo era de Bernaldo' (*N.B.A.E.*, i, pp. 371, 380). If the ballads referred to by Alvarez Gato are not those we know, we can draw no inference from his reference.

To establish the priority of the ballads of native epic derivation it would be necessary to adduce examples whose composition could be placed earlier than that of the earliest of these frontier and lyrical ballads, i.e. before 1368. Yet we do not know that any can be placed as early even as the latest of those we have mentioned, c. 1450. Absence of knowledge, as with the epic, is no proof of non-existence, but we can only reason solidly on the basis of our knowledge, which here is limited to this, that by the mid-fifteenth century there were in existence two types of *romance*, the historical and the lyrical, one related to contemporary incident, the other showing affinities with the Portuguese-Galician lyric, and neither presenting any obvious or demonstrable dependence on the epic, if we leave on one side for the moment the question of metre.

It may be objected that to the topicality of the frontier ballads is due their earlier appearance in writing. Here again the evidence of the chronicles will be, if not conclusive, highly significant. Prior to Professor Entwistle's demonstration of the fact in Ayala, Sr Menéndez Pidal had pointed out how, in the second half of the fifteenth century, these cease to draw on the *cantares de gesta* and turn instead to the *romances* for confirmation and illustration, and he has himself held this change coincident in time with the final decay of the epic and its decomposition into ballad.¹ But the earliest mentions are again of frontier and not of heroic ballads. In the *Crónica de Juan II*, where the first examples he has noted occur ('Buen Alcaide de Cañete', 'Ya se salen de Jaén'), the choice is, as in Ayala, *de rigueur*. Not so with the *Cuarta Crónica General*, c. 1460, a phenomenon in the series of *Crónicas Generales* in that it does not lay the *cantares de gesta* under contribution. Their day, it appears, was over, yet neither does it introduce the heroic ballads which should have replaced them, as, it must be presumed, it would have done had they then been current. The inclusion in its text of the ballad attributed to Alfonso the Wise, 'Yo salí de la mi tierra', which cannot be given an epic source and ends indeed with a reminiscence from the *mester de clerecía*, shows it alive to the existence and interest of the kind as source material. A decade later, c. 1470, a credulous *arreglo* of the *Sumario de los Reyes de España*² prosifies some lines of the ballad 'Rey don Sancho, Rey don Sancho, no digas que no te aviso', and the instance appears to be unique for the remainder of the century.

This difficulty of early documentation is only one of several in the way of the theory that gives to the *romancero* an epic origin. Professor S. G. Morley has stressed another, the impossibility of relating more than a

¹ *Poesía juglaresca*, pp. 428-30.

² Ed. Llaguno (1781), p. 25.

very few ballads of the heroic category directly to the epic.¹ Of some eighty 'old' historical ballads thirty-five deal with the Cid; of them he can find only five to be definitely traceable to the two extant epic compositions on that hero. If to the epics be added the epic matter on whatever theme embedded in the chronicles, eight more 'show an intimate connexion of some sort'. Thirteen out of eighty, none offering early record, and in all of which 'the deviations from the original epic matter are greater than the resemblances'—it is a slight ground on which to erect such a super-structure of theory. A whole group, moreover, such as the Rodrigo cycle, may spring demonstrably not from an epic source, even where the existence of such is postulated, but from a prose narrative, in this case Pedro del Corral's *Crónica Sarracina* of c. 1430.² In the Cid cycle many must be allowed to date from the publication of the *Crónica Particular del Cid* in 1512, as others were to date from that of Ocampo's *Tercera Crónica General* in 1541. 'Hélo, hélo, por do viene el moro por la calzada', which Menéndez Pelayo held to be the oldest of all the Cid ballads, he had to admit to be 'un producto del siglo XV, completamente original y *sporádico*', showing not even a remote dependence on either epic or chronicle.³

But external evidence, particularly where negative, cannot be conclusive, and much of the argument for the priority of ballads in the epic tradition inevitably rests on internal characteristics. The genuine *viejo* will have an 'arranque', a 'rapidez del diálogo', a 'fogoso empuje', it will breathe, in short, that 'aliento de la musa heroica' which we are to believe went out with the epic tradition and was never to be recaptured. Here too there is an initial difficulty in that the detecting of this 'aliento' will always be an exercise of subjective criticism in which the most eminent authorities may differ. 'Cabalga Diego Laínez', that to Menéndez Pelayo showed 'un ingenio y primor de detalles que revela a un poeta culto',⁴ is to Sr Menéndez Pidal the perfect example of the popular *viejo* detached from epic recitation.⁵ But this apart, the argument will naturally lose its pertinence if it be once admitted that the epic tradition

¹ 'Spanish Ballad Problems. The Native Historical Themes' (*Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology*, XIII (1925), pp. 216-17).

² Menéndez Pidal, *Floresta de leyendas heroicas españolas. Rodrigo, el último Godo*, II (1925), p. 7.

³ *Antología de líricos*, XI, pp. 360-3. P. 361: 'este romance es uno de los pocos que obligan a admitir desde cierto tiempo (no seguramente antes del siglo XIV) la elaboración de romances sueltos dentro de los ciclos históricos.' This Professor Lang unaccountably twisted to mean, with Carolina Michaélis, that it is 'a survival of a lay or trio of lays handed down on the lips of men from a period considerably anterior to the fourteenth century' (*Romantic Review*, V, p. 348).

⁴ *Antología de líricos*, XI, p. 348.

⁵ *L'Épopée Castillane à travers la Littérature Espagnole* (1910), p. 143.

survived well into the fifteenth century, i.e. that heroic ballads such as 'Castellanos y leoneses tienen malas intenciones', which Sr Menéndez Pidal would derive from a popular epic on Fernán González prior to 1344,¹ could spring from disintegration of the epic and still be posterior to other types of ballad.

It will be further weakened in what pertinence may remain outside the problem of priority if it be not demonstrated—as its supporters have, we think, failed to do—that these characteristics are in fact inseparable from an immediate epic source. Menéndez Pelayo, at variance with his admission in respect of 'Hélo, hélo, por do viene', had no hesitation in inferring the existence of not one but several epics to explain a single ballad, 'Con cartas y mensajeros el rey al Carpio envió', because of its possession of the aforesaid characteristics.² Sr Menéndez Pidal follows suit in a readiness to believe in a whole sequence of unknown epics, 'la serie de gestas hoy perdidas que es necesario suponer para explicar satisfactoriamente los primitivos romances carolingios que tan apartados se muestran de sus originales franceses'.³ Both show a strange reluctance to credit any heroic ballad poet with inventive or poetic qualities of his own, although they cannot withhold them from the authors of the lyrical ballads. Sr Menéndez Pidal once touches, indeed, on a line of thought that, had he been interested to pursue it, might have led to a considerable lightening of the burden of hypothetical epic that weighs so heavily on the Spanish Parnassus.⁴ 'Como caracteres de ancianidad', he writes of the 'Romance de la Pérdida de Ben Zulema', 'pueden señalarse la notable irregularidad métrica de los versos, su marcha rauda, su tono vivo y sobrio y esa inspiración realista y austera que tanto asemeja nuestra más antigua poesía fronteriza a la epopeya del siglo XIII'.⁵ Here are the same qualities admitted in a rigorously historical frontier ballad, and for once they do not bring a suggestion of necessary dependence on the epic or of the intervention of the heroic ballad as a link between the two.

Their existence in a historic ballad that is neither of the frontier, where a spirit akin to the 'heroic' atmosphere of epic times would be com-

¹ 'Notas para el Romancero del Conde Fernán González,' in *Homenaje a Menéndez Pelayo*, I (1899), p. 451.

² *Antología de líricos*, XI, p. 207.

³ *La Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara* (1896, reprinted 1934), p. xiv. Professor Entwistle has shown that several of these were originally conceived as ballads ('Concerning certain Spanish Ballads in the French Epic Cycles of Aymeri, Aiol (Montesinos), and Ogier de Dinamarque,' in *A Miscellany of Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures presented to Leon E. Kastner* (1932)).

⁴ For a list of the twenty odd epics postulated by Menéndez Pelayo, see Lang, *Romanic Review*, v (1914), p. 326 n.

⁵ *El Romancero. Teorías e Investigaciones* (1928), pp. 99-100. The ballad, 'De Granada partió el moro' is given in Menéndez Pelayo, *Antología de líricos*, x, p. 359.

prehensible, nor of the epic tradition but on a theme well attested in a chronicle sequence would be conclusive of this inherent weakness we see in the 'internal evidence' argument for the disintegration theory. The theme of 'Válasme, Nuestra Señora', mentioned above in connexion with Juan de Mena, is found already in the *Crónica de Fernando IV* which c. 1350, i.e. within some forty years of his death, relates the *emplazamiento* of the monarch as simple historic fact. The tale is repeated in the *Crónica de Alfonso Onceno*, again, with increment, in Rodríguez de Almela's *Valerio de las historias escolásticas*, which is the first to give the names of the brothers and the manner of their death, and in the *Crónica abreviada* of his contemporary Diego de Valera.¹ No one has yet postulated the existence of an epic on Fernando IV, although Menéndez Pelayo, arguing for the antiquity of the ballad on the arbitrary ground of a change of assonance, 'lo cual es siempre indicio de mayor antigüedad en los romances',² would apparently have needed little inducement to do so. That the ballad is not the source of the chronicles is clear from the divergences and the omissions of central incident and vivid detail in the latter. It must therefore be conceded to have originated either independently or from a prose narrative (and there will be no good reason for denying the author the same inventiveness and poetic licence in the second case as in the first). Yet we submit that here are to be found all the qualities in question, 'el arranque, la rapidez del diálogo, el fogoso empuje, el admirable partido que su autor saca de las repeticiones épicas', and to a degree that on purely internal evidence would place the ballad high in the category of primitive heroic romances. Lines of so-called epic flavour and vigour abound:

—Presos, presos, caballeros,
presos, presos, hijosdalgo.
—No por vos, el almirante,
si de otro no traéis mandado.

The lines

—Manténgate Dios, el rey.
—Mal vengades, hijosdalgo...

are close kin to those from 'Con cartas y mensajeros':

—Manténgavos Dios, buen rey,
y a cuantos con vos están.
—Mal vengades vos, Bernaldo,
traidor, hijo de mal padre.

¹ See Menéndez Pelayo, *Antología de líricos*, XII, pp. 102-7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 101. Note that in the version given by Galíndez as the 'romance antiguo que solía oír cantar muchas veces la Reyna Católica' (*ibid.*, pp. 99-100) the introduction with the different assonance is lacking, it being the only improvement this version can show over the earlier one. These lines exalting the king's piety have nothing to do with the rest of the ballad, and suggest a counterblast to the attribution to him of impiety found in Descoll's *Crónica del rey d' Aragón en Pere IV lo Ceremoniós* (see *ibid.*, p. 103 n.).

If there be borrowing here, only proof of the priority of the latter will establish it as the one influencing and not the one influenced. Here too there is 'algo de anárquico y feudal':

—Justicia, justicia, rey,
pues que somos tus vasallos,
de don Pedro Carvajal
y de don Alonso su hermano,
que nos corren nuestras tierras
y nos robaban el campo,
y nos fuerzan las mujeres
a tuerto y desaguizado.

And this affinity to the epic ballads is curiously borne out by the Galíndez version which, recorded half a century later, bears to the earlier one the same relation as does the *Crónica Rimada* to the *Mío Cid*. On internal evidence, that is to say, one might postulate here a second, 'decadent' epic source, wherein what is suggestion in the first is exploited for violent effect.

Por las sus jornadas ciertas
en Jaén habían entrado...

which is all the first tells us of the journey of the captives to the king, becomes:

Se parten los caballeros,
se parten los hijosdalgo,
con los grillos a los pies,
con esposas a las manos.
Jornada de quince días
en ocho la habían andado.

Their punishment in the first:

Mándales cortar los pies,
mándales cortar las manos,
y mándalos despeñar
de aquella peña de Martos...

is expanded to:

donde en el tercero día
la sentencia había dado
que les cortasen los pies
y les cortasen las manos,
y les sacasen sus ojos,
los sus ojos a entrambos,
y mandólos despeñar
de aquella peña de Martos,
o de la sierra de Ayllón
porque cayessen más alto...

the last line of which shows decadent exaggeration defeating its own ends and becomes absurd. The brothers' invocation of God and the saints is extended to include the devil, and the king's death, finally, is protracted in violation alike of history and of artistry. The epic characteristics and

processes are not, then, prerogatives of the ballads of epic derivation,¹ and a chronology of origins based chiefly on internal evidence must take this into account.

The theory of epic disintegration finds firmer ground, doubtless, in the metrical argument. No one will deny at least an octosyllabic tendency in our two extant epic compositions and the difficulty of finding another explanation for the alternate assonance that is a basic feature of the *romancero*. It may nevertheless be pointed out that the provisional acceptance of a theory as that most in accord with our limited knowledge does not entitle us to advance it dogmatically while doubts and difficulties still bristle around it. Were Menéndez Pelayo's twenty odd epics to come to light and show the assonanced double octosyllable triumphant we should speak with an authority far different from that afforded by two fragmentary texts of notoriously faulty transmission. In the meantime, to assume that the *cantares* embedded in the chronicles necessarily conform to these two fragments, or to the standard that we may think these two fragments ought themselves to conform to, is to beg the question. Sr Puyol y Alonso has given a salutary lesson of the hazards of reconstruction and the impossibility of drawing valid metrical conclusions therefrom,² while Sr Menéndez Pidal has himself now recanted his earlier faith in an octosyllabic basis for the epic.³ In the light of this the latter's inferences from his reconstructed *Cantar de los Infantes de Lara* must be accepted with reserve, as when, commenting on the abundance of paragogic e's, he says: 'Este hecho es en sí muy importante, pues contribuye a probar que no sólo en el metro y en las rimas eran iguales los romances viejos a las gestas nuevas, sino también en los caracteres accesorios de la versificación', only to contradict its importance straight-way: 'Pero que su uso era general en el siglo XIII nos lo prueba que estaba ya adoptado por la poesía culta para fabricar consonantes', citing the *Poema de Fernán González*, the *Poema de José*, and the *Santa María Egipciaca*.⁴

The *Cantar de los Infantes de Lara* is a hypothetical text. To the two authentic texts, however vitiated, must be granted the authority due to their uniqueness, it being always remembered that to the medieval *jugar* rhythm with assonance was the chief stand-by of memory, which

¹ Further evidence may be found in Sr Menéndez Pidal's study of the ballad 'Después que el rey don Rodrigo', a 'romance juglaresco' carved out of the *Crónica Sarracina* of Pedro del Corral that by the beginning of the seventeenth century had become epic-lyrical (*Flóresta de leyendas heroicas españolas*, II, pp. 22-8).

² *El Cantar de Gesta de don Sancho II de Castilla*, pp. 16-7.

³ *La Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara*, 2nd edit. (1934), pp. 485-6.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 418-19.

makes it hard to believe that his MS. could be infinitely removed from what he had memorized and was accustomed to deliver. It may thus be more profitable to relate the texts we have, not to hypothetical texts of the same kind, but to actual poetic texts whatever their nature. And in fact this so-called epic irregularity, like the paragoge *e*, is not confined to the *cantares*. Within the *mester de clerecía*, as Restori and Lidforss¹ have noted, parallels abound. If the clerics professing the 'nueva maestría de sillauas cuntadas' were capable of such a fall from grace that in the *Vida de San Ildefonso* four hundred and fifty out of little over a thousand lines are inexact, many beyond repair, if the same incapacity for sustained syllable-count can be pointed to in the *Vida de Santa María Egipcíaca*, the *Libro de los Reyes*, and even, roughly contemporary with the *Crónica Rimada*, in the *Poema de Alfonso Onceno*, whose rimes (but not whose metre) may be patched up by reference to Galician, it must be admitted that the tendency to isolate epic and ballad and force a connexion is not treating the evidence with impartiality.

In ninety lines of the *Crónica Rimada* Sr Menéndez Pidal counted fourteen that might pass as double octosyllables.² Here is a tendency, indeed, but a far from pronounced one when we are asked to accept it as a stage towards the almost faultless scansion of the 'Cercada tiene a Baeza' of a generation earlier. The metrical achievement of the latter we may of course choose to attribute not to the fourteenth century but to Argote de Molina and the sixteenth, provided we recognize that this will debar us from adducing any notable metrical irregularity elsewhere as proof of the antiquity of a *romance*, as we have seen Sr Menéndez Pidal do for 'De Granada partió el moro'; but the other ballads we have cited previous to 1450 will still argue for a notable degree of regularity in the kind from the beginning.

Isolated imperfect lines, it is true, are easy to find, and Sr Menéndez Pidal, who earlier believed in 'el octosilabismo regular del romance', which allowed him to regard faulty lines as corrupt and to propose emendations, now rejects this theory too in favour of a traditionally unstable metrical scheme, which will still, needless to say, be that of the *cantares de gesta*.³ But again a more natural approach to the problem would be to relate metrical accomplishment in the ballad, not to that of distant hypothetical forbears, but to that found in other forms of fifteenth-century poetry. If the level is the same, the cause will presumably

¹ *Los Cantares de myo Cid*, pp. 102-3.

² *La Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara*, p. 417.

³ *El Romancero. Teorías e Investigaciones*, p. 99 n.

be the same. Folk-poetry has never needed tradition to explain its metrical shortcomings, and learned poetry in the fifteenth century was still struggling laboriously at some remove from the ideal it had set itself. Witness the awkwardnesses of the 'sonetos fechos al itálico modo' of Santillana, a studious metrist, as his *Prohemio* makes clear. Contemporary with the *Prohemio* are the two romances by Carvajales in the *Cancionero de Stúñiga*. Both have faulty lines, but that these have nothing to do with epic survivals is shown by the fact that there are just as many imperfections in Carvajales's other compositions and that they can be paralleled in three out of the four poems by Santillana himself in the same *Cancionero*, the fourth being a mere twelve lines long. The faulty scansion of the initial line of 'Retrayda estaba la reyna', that some might respect as testifying to honourable descent, is Carvajales's own; his model, the ballad 'Retrayda está la infanta', begins with a correct octosyllable. The ballads, in short, from their birth in record show a much greater command of metre than the epics at their death, and their birth, instead of following close upon that death, precedes it by a considerable period.

Of the mode of delivery of the epic we have no certain knowledge.¹ The ballad, sung, as seems probable, from the beginning, had need of a definite metre. The regular octosyllable was already to its hand in a long lyrical tradition with Galician-Portuguese affinities, and these affinities we have seen pass over to the romance at least as early as 1421, in the MS. of Jaume de Olesa, where the argument for two types of octosyllable, ballad (ex epic) and lyric,² breaks down. It is to be remembered, as a further possibility, that the presumed basic type of epic verse, a sixteen-syllabled line with two equal hemistichs, is well attested outside the epic, and handled with a regularity we have no grounds for supposing the epic ever achieved. Grouped in stanza form, and now rimed, now assonanced, it appears in the *Libro de Buen Amor*, in Ayala's *Rimado de Palacio*, and even, styled 'versetes de antiguo rimar', in the *Cancionero de Baena*, i.e. in the same fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that witness the emergence and triumph of the romance. The ballad metre may well have come from this tradition, some may even call it an epic tradition,³ but it will not follow that the ballad in its genesis had any direct contact with the epic,

¹ Menéndez Pidal, *Cantar de mio Cid*, I, pp. 102-3.

² Menéndez Pelayo, *Antología de líricos*, XI, p. 99.

³ 'Estos versetes de antiguo rimar y de origen épico,' says Menéndez Pelayo (*Antología de líricos*, XI, p. 98), glossing over any difficulty in the passage from assonance to rime and from *laisse* to stanza. It is to be noted that Encina, often cited as a witness for the form of the early ballad, himself wrote ballads in perfect rime instead of assonance, 'as is often the case at this period' (Morley, *Romanic Review*, VII (1916), p. 57).

much less that it arose from epic disintegration. Assonance will still direct attention to the epic, but it may be noted, in parenthesis, that the occurrence of alternate assonance in the English ballad has not necessitated any theory of previous monorime double lines, and, tradition apart, assonance remains for the unskilled poet, such as the soldier wishing to celebrate a frontier incident, an easier device than rime, witness even the English National Anthem. Its sanction by a previous tradition and by the nature of the language was enough to commend it, without its being incumbent on us to make of a direct filiation with that tradition an article of faith.

A final consideration making for caution may be adduced here. We have noted the reference in Juan de Mena to 'rústicos deste cantando', and he has another to the 'villa no poco cantada'. The first, to Sr Menéndez Pidal, indicates 'Válasme, Nuestra Señora'. The second, to Hernán Núñez, indicated 'Alora, la bien cercada'. But whatever probability attaches to these identifications, it can never become certainty. Juan de Mena is not speaking upon oath, and the currency of a ballad, 'Alora, la bien cercada', written some ten years before may well have been considerable in the circles where he moved. So a social historian of the Great War could write of Tipperary as 'la villa no poco cantada'. But present conditions are infinitely more favourable to the rapid propagation of a single song over wide areas, and even so the future student, coming on such a reference, could establish its identity to his critical satisfaction only from knowledge of the non-existence of any other such song, not from inference.

It is a point of importance that the ballad was not the only form in which frontier incidents were celebrated in verse. The *romance* 'De Granada partió el moro' is only one of three poetic accounts of the loss of Ben Zulema on the first of May, 1424. A second is a poem in *coplas de arte mayor* by the soldier Juan Galindo. The third is a *dezir*, octosyllabic but in rimed quartets, by Ruy Páez de Ribera.¹ Much later, the death of don Alonso de Aguilar in May 1501 inspired a lyric written in *coplas*:

Ay, Sierra Bermeja,
por mi mal os vi,
que el bien que tenía
en tí lo perdí...

that since it shows much greater historical accuracy must be set nearer to the event than the *romance* 'Estando el rey don Fernando'.² And much earlier, the *Poema de Alfonso Onceno*, written before 1350 by a witness of

¹ See Menéndez Pidal, *El Romancero. Teorías e Investigaciones*, p. 97.

² See Menéndez Pelayo, *Antología de líricos*, xii, p. 237.

the victory of the Salado in 1340, is composed in octosyllabic quatrains, although Menéndez Pelayo considers it 'el último eco del *mester de juglaría*' and sees therein 'cierta semejanza con los romances'.¹ From these examples, and there may be many more, it would appear that the *romance*, far from being the predestined form for the events it sang, is to be regarded rather as having been the one to emerge victorious from a process of experiment and elimination, and even so as having never vanquished its rivals completely. It is at all events something other and less simple than the direct inheritor of an epic tradition that laid down its metrical formula just as and when its successor was to pick it up.²

No theory as yet advanced for the origins of the *romancero* can be regarded as proven. None is here advanced, our concern having been merely to invite theorists to temper assurance by taking more account of a fact, that the earliest attested types of Spanish ballad, the frontier and the lyric, have already a long tradition behind them before the emergence in record of the heroic type, and of a possibility, however remote, that the survival of the epic well into the fifteenth century may have led to its exploitation for heroic ballads when once the kind had been established in form and favour. These heroic ballads would still be early, as early we think as any critic of to-day, save the late Professor H. R. Lang, is prepared to claim for them, and would still undergo all the processes associated with long oral tradition, but they would not be the earliest. The suggestion of this possibility is not new. Already in 1898 Gaston Paris had remarked: 'On peut dès lors se demander si c'est l'usage de détacher des *cantares de gesta* une ou plusieurs laisses pour les chanter isolément qui a donné naissance aux romances épisodiques composées d'emblée sur des faits contemporains, ou si c'est au contraire la naissance et la vogue des romances de ce genre qui a fait détacher des anciens *cantares de gesta* des épisodes qu'on s'est mis à chanter isolément.'³ His preference for the first hypothesis, resting on such considerations as: 'Il faut admettre que c'est aux *cantares* que les romances, qui en ont absolument la forme et le style, ont dû leur première inspiration', did not however follow on an exhaustive inquiry into the second, and does not rule this out of court. Sr Rajna for all his caution has no hesitation in denying this double affinity of form and style, although to him the other line of approach is a

¹ *Op. cit.*, III, p. 117, XI, p. 9.

² It is clear that an epic, having given birth to ballads by fragmentation, need not *ipso facto* cease to exist as an epic, but the other view is that implied by Sr Menéndez Pidal (e.g. *Poesía juglaresca*, p. 414). The point does not affect our present consideration of the chronology of heroic relative to frontier and lyrical ballads.

³ *Journal des Savants* (1898), p. 334.

'lubrica strada'.¹ M. Cirot recognizes in the *romance* a kind possessed of its own individuality and capable of impressing it on material derived from the most diverse sources.²

In approaching a problem where every theory can still be made to appear plausible by neglecting the evidence for the others there is still need for a prudent temper. The grand synthesis which shall collate all the evidence dispassionately remains to be made. Sr Menéndez Pidal deprecates the reluctance of others to see eye to eye with him concerning the evolution of the *romancero*, 'tan embrollada recientemente por algunos escritores que buscan la gran novedad de resucitar teorías que se han muerto de viejas'.³ Yet so long as it is possible to feel honest doubts concerning the fact and the simplicity of the transformation of epic into ballad as this presents itself to him, a mere troubling of the waters will remain a legitimate exercise of criticism.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

¹ *Romanic Review*, vi (1915), p. 26.

² *Bulletin Hispanique*, xxi (1919), p. 103.

³ *Poesía juglaresca*, p. 416.

MANUSCRIPTS OF ST ELIZABETH OF SCHÖNAU IN ENGLAND

IN publishing 'Poem on the Assumption',¹ Miss J. P. Strachey remarked (p. 14 n.) that Roth's edition of the visions and letters of St Elizabeth of Schönau² needed completing and correcting regarding the information therein given on the Latin MSS. of Elizabeth in England. Apparently Roth's information on these MSS. was limited to what he could learn from the catalogues then available. The purpose of the present note is to supplement, and where necessary to correct, such data on the basis of personal examination of the MSS. At the same time are listed additional MSS. of the material which escaped Roth's notice, together with versions in five vernacular languages.

The MSS. in England noticed by Roth are as follows: Oxford, St John's College 1833;³ Oxford, Bodl. E.a.2287,13;⁴ Cheltenham, Phillippus 2014;⁵ London, Brit. Mus. 15,723.⁵

The St John's MS. is now numbered 149. Coxe's description seems not to have been known to Roth, although published in 1852.⁶ The MS. contains 205 folios with 25 long lines to the page, measuring 210 × 140 mm. It was written toward the end of the twelfth century in England, in a hand characteristic rather of the north than of the main centres (Oxford, Canterbury, etc.); the MS. opens, moreover, with a prologue and letter of Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx. The initials, not very skilfully executed, are alternately red and blue flourished with the opposite colour; occasionally a green initial occurs, flourished with red. A bright shade of blue is usually used, more rarely an unusual dark shade. The Elizabeth material begins on f. 114^a; the other contents of the MS. are listed in detail by Coxe. With the exception of *Passio SS. virginum 11000 apud Coloniam* (ff. 181^b–191^b) they are unrelated to the Elizabeth material.

The Bodleian MS. number printed by Roth as E.a.2287,13 should read E.2.2287.13 and his reference to Bernard's *CMA* should be I. i, p. 118 (not p. 128). The MS. is now Bodl. 83 and is described in detail in the

¹ In *Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts*, ed. O. H. Prior (Cambridge, 1924), pp. 13–26.

² F. W. E. Roth, *Die Visionen und Briefe der hl. Elisabeth nach den Original-Handschriften* (2nd ed., Brünn, 1886).

³ Id. p. xli; the reference to Bernard's *CMA* p. 61 is in Tom. I, pars II.

⁴ Id. p. xliii.

⁵ Id. p. xliiv.

⁶ H. O. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur*, II (Oxford, 1852), pp. 45–6.

Summary Catalogue under No. 2287.¹ It contains 94 vellum folios measuring *ca.* 185 × 135 mm., written in 22 long lines to the page. Quires were signed by catch-words in the lower right-hand margin of the last page, in most places now cut off, but still visible on ff. 16^b and 32^b. Initials are for the most part red and fairly simple; rubrics and colophons are in the script of the text in red. The opening initial on f. 1^a is more elaborate, and is unusual in both colour and pattern: it is a D, insular uncial in shape, once heightened with a colour now faded to grey; the bow of the letter is filled with a classical foliate design, suggestive of the graceful patterns of early Roman stucco, in white on a black ground. Except for some verses at the end, which are found also in the St John's MS., ff. 170^a–176^a, the Elizabeth material fills practically the whole of the volume. The MS. is palimpsest. A leaf of the original MS. was folded to make a bifolium of the present one, so that the two texts are written at right angles to each other. Prickings for the primary rulings are visible in the lower margins and yellow vertical streaks on many pages show where the first writing was. The lines are widely spaced. The writing itself is discernible on a number of pages and in some places letters or syllables can be deciphered. The script is strongly Anglo-Saxon in character, bold and round enough to be of the early tenth century. The text may be liturgical.

Phillipps MS. 2014, though listed in the Middlehill catalogue, is not now at Cheltenham, nor has Mr Fenwick any record of its ever having been there.² I have not found it catalogued among Phillipps MSS. on the Continent. It appears in the Middlehill catalogue as one of the MSS. from the Abbey of St Martin of Tournay. The part which contained, *inter alia*, Elizabeth's Visions and her sermon on the Eleven Thousand Virgins of Cologne was Tournay MS. A 13.³

The British Museum MS. is Add. 15723.⁴ It has 117 folios measuring about 180 × 130 mm. Ff. 1^a–69^b are in a fairly large hand with 25 long lines to the page; ff. 70^a to the end are in a smaller hand with 29 lines to the page. The script of the first hand is Rhenish of about A.D. 1200 (saec. XII–XIII). A slip in the front of the MS. states that it probably belonged to Cîteaux. Red and blue are used in initials and rubrics. The Elizabeth

¹ F. Madan-H. H. E. Craster, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, II, 1 (Oxford, 1922), p. 290.

² Ascertained on a visit to Thirlestaine House in the autumn of 1933.

³ *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum in bibliotheca D. Thomae Phillipps Bart.* (Middlehill, 1837), p. 23.

⁴ *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years 1846–7* (London, 1864), p. 16. This also was apparently unknown to Roth, since it says books 1, 3 and 4 of the Visions are found in this MS. whereas Roth says books 1–3; in fact the MS. contains, according to Roth's numeration, I, §§ 1–25 ($\frac{1}{2}$), IV, II, §§ 31–2.

material is contained in the first 64 folios. There is no colophon at the foot of f. 64^a where this material ends. On f. 64^b begin Miracles of the Virgin followed by other unrelated matter.¹

The Elizabeth material as edited by Roth² comprises the *Visiones* (in three books), the *Liber viarum Dei*, the *Revelationes de sacro exercitu virginum Coloniensium* (under varying titles), and the *Epistolae*. Chapters 31–32 of Book II of the *Visiones* frequently appear as a separate unit entitled *Visio de resurrectione beate virginis matris domini*. One or more of these items often occur in MSS. without the rest;³ other material relating to Elizabeth or to Ursula sometimes follows.

Roth collated four MSS. which he designated as A (Wiesbaden 3, saec. XII ex.), B (Wiesbaden 4, a late fifteenth-century copy of A; see pp. xxvii–xxix), C (Munich, Lat. 324, saec. XIII), F (Merseburg, Dombibl. Pergam. 4^o. 96, saec. XII ex. or XIII in.).⁴ He took A, the most complete, as his accepted text. The following examination shows the disposition of the material in the three MSS. now in England, as compared with Roth's edition. St John's 149 = J, Bodl. 83 = O, B.M. Add. 15723 = L.

Eckbert's prologue to the Visions, printed by Roth, is found, according to him,⁵ only in MSS. Wiesbaden 3, 4, and Vienna 488; *Omnes qui lecturi sunt... aperta sunt omnia*. The three MSS. in England (JLO) have instead of Eckbert's prologue one addressed by Roger Gustum⁶ to B. Abbot of Ford: *Dilecto quondam magistro... littera conscribi iuberet*. They then begin, like A, the first book of the Visions: *Fuit in diebus pape Eugenii secundi⁷ in Treverensi episcopatu in cenobio cui nomen Sconaugia...*, but break off a few lines below, after the date MCLII, adding *cepit videre visiones*. In A immediately after this date there follows in the third person an explanation of the circumstances of the Visions: *visitata est a domino... initium erat huiusmodi*, and an introductory sentence by Elizabeth: *Petis a me frater, et ad hoc venisti... dignatus est in me*. JLO resume A's text at this point with *Promptum quidem est in me...*⁸

¹ Details in *Catal. of Additions...*, *ut supra cit.*, and in H. L. D. Ward, *Catalogue of Romances... in the British Museum*, II (London, 1893), pp. 622 sqq.

² The earlier editions and their variant material are discussed at length by Roth, *op. cit.*, pp. xlvii sqq.

³ Miss Strachey indicated a group of such MSS. containing only the 'Vision of the Assumption' (II. 31–2), preceded by the two first sentences of the *Life* (*Cambridge A.N. Texts*, p. 14).

⁴ Roth, *op. cit.*, pp. xxii, xxvii, xxxiv, xxxvi.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. xxv.

⁶ On the material obtained by Roger, his disposition of it, and its subsequent dissemination see Roth, *op. cit.*, pp. li sqq.

⁷ A omits *secundi*.

⁸ J inserts this rubric before *Promptum*: *Incipit allocutio Elisabeth (sic)*; and L this: *Liber eiusdem de temptationibus inimici quas primo sustinuit et de revelationibus divinis quas postmodum vidit*. Paris MSS. B.N. lat. 2873, f. 66 and 5279, f. 136 are in many respects similar to JLO (Roth, *op. cit.*, pp. xxxi–xxxiii).

showing a considerable number of variants, some of which correspond to those noted by Roth in his *apparatus criticus*. These three MSS. resemble each other in their variants more than they do A. At the end of Book I, chap. 14, JLO add a sentence which is not noted in Roth's *apparatus*: *Cumque eorum intuitu delectata fuisset ab oculis meis subito ablatis sunt* (J f. 122^a, L f. 7^{a-b}, O f. 12^b). Halfway through A's version of Book I, § 25, JLO break off at: . . . *introspexi quasi per ostium* (J f. 128^a, L f. 13^a, O f. 21^a; Roth, *op. cit.*, p. 15, line 1: no note in *apparatus*) and there follows immediately a passage: *Factum est in una dierum mensis iulii ego Elisabeth . . . scio quod pre timoris magnitudine subsistere non poteris*, which I have not traced in Roth.¹ This closes the Visions in JLO and the *Liber viarum Dei* follows immediately (J f. 128^b, L f. 13^b, O f. 21^b).² Thus rather more than half of the first, all of the second except the 'Vision of the Assumption' (see below), and all of the third books of the Visions are omitted from these three MSS.

In the rubric of the *Liber viarum Dei* JO have the following variants³ not recorded in Roth's *apparatus criticus*: *spiritus sanctus* for *spiritus domini*, *salutem hominum* for *salutem omnium*, *suscipiunt* for *percipiunt*; L has MCLVI agreeing with A, but O has MCLVII, and in J an original *septimo* has been erased and not replaced. The three MSS. agree quite closely in content with A through nineteen chapters of the *Liber viarum Dei*, ending there with . . . *O quam amabilis est pater vester . . . in secula seculorum. Amen.*⁴ Between this point and the twentieth chapter found in A (Roth, *op. cit.*, p. 122) is inserted the *Visio Elisabeth quam vidit de resurrectione beate virginis matris domini: In anno quo mihi per angelum domini annunciabatur liber viarum dei, in die quo octavam assumptionis domine nostre ecclesia celebrat. . . usque ad dominice annunciationis sollemnitatatem* (J f. 152^b, L f. 47^a, O f. 67^a=II, 31-2, Roth, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-5).

¹ It is found in *Sanctae Elisabeth Vita*, cap. v, § 84 (Migne, *Patr. lat.*, cxcv, 163).

² Curiously enough, Roth assumed (p. lii) that the *Liber viarum Dei* was not known to Roger.

³ L agrees with A except that *spiritus* stands unqualified.

⁴ In J there are considerable lacunae in three of the sermons of the *Liber viarum Dei*. Several leaves are missing between f 132^b and 133^a comprising the text of the first sermon between the words: . . . *sum in sublime et quasi in vicino* (O f. 27^b line 1, Roth, p. 92, line 11) and *eius sunt in certamine* . . . (O f. 37^a line 4, Roth, p. 98, line 39). After f. 134^b is another loss which must have occurred soon after the MS. was written, for *deficit* is written in the lower margin in pencil by a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century hand; this lacuna represents the text between . . . *Post hec aperiens os suum locutus est dicens* (O f. 39^b line 10, Roth, p. 100, line 31) and *necesse est ambulantes in ea* . . . (O f. 43^b line 6, Roth, p. 103, line 22) in the fourth sermon (called *tertius* by A: Roth, p. 100). The third gap is in the sixth sermon between . . . *comminationis assumens ait* (O f. 55^b line 16, Roth, p. 112, penultimate line) and *Multa dum talia* . . . (O f. 58^a line 14, Roth, p. 114, line 7 from end); this may be a scribal omission due to homoeoteleuton rather than a case of lost pages, for *Multa* is preceded in complete texts by *respondens ait*. In the present tight binding it is difficult to ascertain precise details about the composition of quires and the nature of losses of leaves.

This arrangement in JLO conforms to that in Roth's C. The *adiuratio* which Roth notes (Anmerkungen, p. xiv, line 6) between chapters 19 and 20 in MS. F appears in JLO between the *Liber viarum Dei* and this *Visio de resurrectione B.V.M.*

The *Liber revelationum Elisabeth de sacro exercitu virginum Coloniensium* (*Vobis qui pros affectus ad ea que sancta sunt geritis...*) follows next as in A (J f. 155^a, L f. 49^b, O f. 70^a), is called, similarly to C, *Sermo Elisabeth de undecim milibus virginibus aliisque martiribus passis inter eas Colonie*, and lacks chap. 22 at its end as do CF. The next passage: *Simili modo posuit deus verba hec in tempore alio. Quedam parva scintilla... Certe si placuerit ei esse ibi... non erit finis* (J f. 168^{a-b}, L f. 62^a, O ff. 84^a-85^a), is one of Elizabeth's letters. In AB it appears as the eleventh, beginning *Quedam parva scintilla...* (Roth, p. 145), with the rubric in B: *Epistola sororibus sanctarum virginum in Colonia*; in F are found the rubric: *Ad sorores Col.*, and an introductory sentence similar to that in JLO.¹ It is followed, as in CF, by the 'sixth' letter, to Abbot Gerlach v. Deuz (*Domino G... Consolamini et gaudete...* = Roth, pp. 141-2).

A short *Visio Egberti* (*Die festo sancte Marie Magdalene... Ipsa autem die obtuli supra easdem reliquias revelationes Elisabeth quas ostendit illi dominus de exitu sancte Ursule regine*) closes the Elizabeth material in the three MSS. in England.² L (f. 64^a, foot) has no colophon. JO have a rubric: *Explicit liber viarum Dei et revelationum Elisabeth* (J f. 170^a, O f. 86^a). The elegiac verses (*Orbis opes pereant tinea putredine labe... Carmine commemoret voce iubente patris*) and the introductory letter preceding them from Roger to the Abbot of Ford (*Item dilectissimo magistro suo frater Rogerus. Metrum quod vobis per Symundum fratrem meum transmissi...*) are the same in both J (ff. 170^a-176^a) and O (ff. 86^a-93^a). On f. 93^b, otherwise blank, of O a later hand wrote: *Hic libellus continet visiones sanctimonialis Elysaabeth et egregios versus de laude beate Marie (virginis a.m.)*; the remaining leaf is blank except for a fifteenth-century note of ownership (*Wyllyam Symons*) on the verso.

Miss Strachey notes that Elizabeth's 'Vision of the Assumption' (= *Visio de resurrectione B.V.M.*), which occupies chapters 31 and 32 of Book II of the *Visiones*, is to be found in Latin in two MSS. at Oxford: Bodl. Laud. Misc. 359, ff. 12-17, and Linc. Coll. 28, ff. 17-19. It is separately indexed in some continental catalogues.

¹ In Roth's note 18 to page 141 (Anmerkungen, p. xvii) Nr. X seems to be a misprint for Nr. XI.

² I have not found this in Roth. A 'visio quam vidit Egbertus' is listed as § vi of Lib. iv, following the same letter to Abbot G. v. Deuz, in the 'Divisio Antiqua' printed by Migne, P.L., cxcv, 125.

Besides these may be added to Roth's list of Elizabeth MSS. the following:¹

ALENÇON 17

Parchment. ff. 194. 240 × 175 mm. s. XIV. Abbaye de la Trappe.
f. 141^b *Visio de resurrectione B.V.M.*² = *Visiones*, II, 31 (Roth, pp. 53-5).

BERLIN 815 [theol. fol. 284]

Parchment. ff. 158. Small folio. s. XII.³ Marienberg.
f. 63 *Liber viarum Dei*, *Visiones*, *Sermones*, *Epistolae*, *Visio de exercitu virg. Colon.*
ff. 111-116 *Passio XI milium virginum*.⁴

BERLIN 816 [theol. fol. 483]

Parchment. ff. 152. Folio. s. XIV. Pelplin.
f. 2 *Liber viarum Dei* (lacking the usual date in the rubric).
ff. 21^b-27^b *Visio de sacro exercitu virg. Colon.*⁵

BERLIN Gorres 41 [lat. fol. 744]

Parchment. ff. 165. 314 × 225 mm. s. XIII.⁶ Himmerode.
f. 163^b *Visiones*, IV, 2-5 (Cologne ed. 1628, pp. 209-12).
ff. 164^a-165^b *Visiones*, III, 4 (Roth, pp. 60-2).⁷

BERN 133

Parchment. ff. 130. Quarto. s. XI-XII.
ff. 91^b-99^b *Visio de sacro exercitu virg. Colon.*⁸

(Cambridge, Magd. Coll. 14 F.1.14. Haenel 22 [L. 5. 33]

s. XV.⁹

ff. 94^a-100^a *Visiones b. virginis Elizabeth filie regis Ungarie: Una dierum cum beata Elizabeth sponsum Christum in secreta oratione consistens... quod potius eligeret mortem quam de predictis ullum modicum quod vera non fuerint dubitaret. Expl. visiones b. Elizabeth.*
Dr James says: 'apparently not St Elizabeth of Hungary but St Elizabeth of Schonau, see *Acta SS.* 18 June (IV, 499)'.¹⁰ I have not found this text in Roth.)

¹ This list is drawn from catalogues. It aims to give, in so far as ascertainable, the material of the MS., the number of folios, size, date, provenance, and the Elizabeth material. Related items such as the Ursula legend are also noted. Manuscripts in parentheses are those about which the catalogue did not clearly indicate whether the Elizabeth referred to was Elizabeth of Schonau; examination of the manuscripts would doubtless remove some from this list and add a number of others.

² H. Omont, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, II (Paris, 1888), p. 494.

³ V. Rose, *Verzeichniss der lateinischen HSS. der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, II, 2 (Berlin, 1903), p. 876.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 881-2. Rose gives a detailed analysis of the contents compared with Roth's edition.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 884.

⁶ F. Schillmann, *Verzeichnis der lateinischen HSS. der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin*, III, *Die Görreshandschriften* (Berlin, 1919), p. 38.

⁷ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 43, 243; the second reference to the *Visiones* is misprinted as III, 3.

⁸ H. Hagen, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium* (Bern, 1874), p. 182.

⁹ M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the College Library of Magdalene College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1909), p. 37.

¹⁰ *Loc. cit.*, p. 39.

68 *Manuscripts of St Elizabeth of Schönaue in England*

(Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Hh.I.11)

Paper. ff. 136. Quarto. s. XV.
ff. 122^a–127^b Life, in English. *On a day as seynt Elyzabeth beyng in deuowt preyowr . . . to thowte ony of hem that ben untrewre etc.* Followed by
ff. 128^a–132^b Sermon on the Assumption of our Lady: *To declare to zow at þis tyme sumwhat of this excellent fest. . . to diuine vnsion in guyche seyntys have here fruiccon. Amen.*¹⁾

(Cheltenham, Phillips 1127)

Vellum. s. XIII. [Ex bibliotheca bibliopolae
Varrentrap ad Frankfort
super Maenum.]

*Vita S. Elisabethae.*²⁾

DURHAM B. IV. 39

Early s. XV.

f. 95^b Prologue and Visions, here divided into 3 books:
'Liber primus (A.D. 1152)' has only 23 chapters,
'Liber secundus' = *Liber viarum Dei*,
'Liber tertius' (ff. 116–123) having 30 chapters may be Book II of Roth's arrangement.³⁾

ERLANGEN 230 [Irm. 490]

Parchment. ff. 134. 290 × 180 mm. s. XII–XIII. Heilsbronn.⁴⁾
f. 92^a *Liber viarum Dei*, with *admiratio* (f. 114^a, erased) and 'Vision of the Assumption'
(ff. 114^b–115) between chapters XIX and XX.
ff. 116^a–124^a *Sermo de XI milibus virginum*.
f. 124^b *Epist. V*, to Abbot Gerlach v. Deuz (Roth, p. 141).
f. 125^a *Epist. XI*, to the Ursulines in Cologne (Roth, p. 145).
f. 125^b *Epist. VI*, to Abbot Gerlach v. Deuz (Roth, pp. 141–2).
f. 126 *Visiones*, III, 20–28, 4, 1–3.
ff. 133^b–134^a *Epist. XXII*, to Abbot Fulbert v. Lasch (Roth, pp. 152–3).
f. 134^a In red: *Explicit liber viarum dei*. Followed, by same hand but smaller and with different ink, by the *admiratio* erased from f. 114^a.⁵⁾ This MS. agrees with C (Cm 324).

(Florence, Bibl. Naz. Centr. II, VIII, 25 [Magl. Cl. XXXV, num. 305])

Paper. s. XV. Accademia della Crusca.
ff. 152–3 *Vita S. Elisabeth* [Fragment].⁶⁾

LAON 178

Parchment. s. XII or XIII. Abbaye de Vauclair.
§ 1. *Visiones*.⁷⁾

¹⁾ *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, III (Cambridge, 1858), pp. 263–4.

²⁾ *Catalogus libr. mss. in bibl. D. Thomae Philippus Bart.* (Middlehill, 1837), p. 14.

³⁾ T. Rud, *Codicum manuscriptorum ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelmensis catalogus classicus* (Durham, 1825), p. 245. It should be remembered that this catalogue was written about a century before it was published, else Rud's manner of dating '[so many] hundred years ago' is misleading.

⁴⁾ H. Fischer, *Die lateinischen Pergamenthandschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen* (Erlangen, 1928), p. 278.

⁵⁾ *Loc. cit.*, p. 279.

⁶⁾ G. M. and F. Pintor, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, XI (Forlì, 1901), p. 230.

⁷⁾ *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, I (Paris, 1849), pp. 129–30.

LILIENTELD 91

Parchment. ff. 110. Quarto. s. XIV.

ff. 99-108 Fragment of the procedure of canonization of Elizabeth Schonaugiensis (*in aliis omnibus concordat cum... Acta sunt haec anno Domini 1234 mense Januario et Februario*).

ff. 109-110 (a.m.) *Visio S. Elisabeth inclusae. Visio Elisabeth, ancillae Domini, quam vidit in Schonaugensi coenobio... in novissimo die de ipso fieri voluerit, fiat.*¹

MONTPELLIER, École de Médecine I, vol. I

Vellum. Large folio.² s. XII or XIII. Clairvaux.³

Visio de sacro exercitu virg. Colon.

*Passio XI milium virg.*⁴

MUNICH lat. 4405 (1085) [Aug. S. Ulr. 105]

ff. 179. Quarto. s. XIV.

ff. 1-48^b *Liber varum Dei.*⁵

MUNICH lat. 4723 (1329) [Bened. 223]

ff. 248. Folio. A.D. 1464 sqq.

ff. 157-184 *Liber varum Dei.*⁶

MUNICH lat. 18626 (1562) [Teg. 626]

ff. 254. Quarto. s. XV.

f. 1 *Vita beatae Elizabeth. (? Schonaugiensis.)*

f. 206 *Visio S. Elizabeth in Schonaugensi coenobio.* (Possibly the 'Vision of the Assumption').

f. 211 *Liber varum Dei.*

f. 239 *Sermo de resurrectione.* (Is this more probably the 'Vision of the Assumption'?)

f. 241 *De XI milibus virginum.*⁷

MUNICH lat. 22253 (275) [Windberg 53]

Parchment. ff. 213. Folio. s. XII.

f. 47 *Visiones Elys. Scon. a. 1156.*

f. 75 *Revelatio eidem facta de resurrectione Mariae et de exercitu XI milium virginum.*

f. 87 *Visio Hildegardis contra Kataros.*

f. 89 *Responsio Elisabeth de eisdem* (possibly = *Visiones*, III, 20 sqq., a letter to Hildegard, see Roth, pp. 74 ff.).

Followed by other works of Eckbert and Hildegard.⁸

PARIS, Arsenal 941 [53 H.L.]

Parchment. ff. 160. 239 × 170 mm. s. XIII.

Saint-Martin des Champs,
no. 124.

f. 155^b *Liber varum Dei* (incomplete at end).⁹

¹ *Xenia Bernardina*, II, 1 (Vienna, 1891), pp. 510-11.

² *Catalogue général (ut supra)*, I, p. 281.

³ G. H. Pertz, *Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, VII (Hannover, 1839), p. 191.

⁴ *Catalogue général (ut supra)*, I, p. 282.

⁵ C. Halm et al., *Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae regiae Monacensis*, I, 2 (ed. altera: Munich, 1894), p. 190.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*, p. 235.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, II, 3 (Munich, 1878), p. 191.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, II, 4 (Munich, 1881), p. 34.

⁹ H. Martin, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de l'Arsenal*, II (Paris, 1886), pp. 185-6.

70 Manuscripts of St Elizabeth of Schönaue in England

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 2042

s. XIII.

Colbert.

§ 18 *Visio de resurrectione beatae Mariae*.¹

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 2332

s. XIII.

Colbert.

§ 7 *Visio de resurrectione B.M.V.* in margin of Miletus' libellus, etc.²

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 3597

Paper

A.D. 1461.

Mazarin.

§ 3 Several of the Visions, in French.³

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5369

Parchment.

s. XIII.

§ 9 *Passio S. Ursulae et XI milium virginum*.

§ 10 *Sermo de XI milibus virginum* (incomplete at end).⁴

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5615

s. XV.

Colbert.

§ 2 *Sermo de XI milibus virginum*.⁵

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. N.A. lat. 760

Parchment. ff. 95. 215 × 152 mm. ss. XIII and XIV. Himmerode.

(f. 62^b 2 visions, the first dated 1170. Elizabeth died in 1165.)

f. 64^a *Liber viarum Dei*.

f. 93^a *Visio de resurrectione B.V.M.*

(f. 94^b 'Magr. Serlo versus: Mundus abit, res nota quidem....')

f. 95 *Scriptum domine Hildegardis ad Elisabeth. Elisabeth Hildegardis. In vera visione hec verba vidit....*⁶

PARIS, Université 790

A.D. 1373.

England.

ff. 58^b-105^a Visions, *Liber viarum Dei*, ? *Revelatio de sacro exercitu...* (Incipit titulus libelli Elisabeth, ancille Christi et sanctimonialis Sconaue. Fuit in diebus... = Roth, p. 1, ... et prelatione frueret et presentia. Explicit liber viarum et revelationum Elisabeth, ancille Christi.)

It would be interesting to compare this MS. with J, for it was written in England (f. 120), and opens with a work by Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx. It had several English owners, including Kenelm Digby, and in the seventeenth century belonged to the Bodleian.⁷

ROME, Vallicelliana C 58, 1⁴ ('Hodie deest')

Parchment.

s. XV.

ff. 66-74 Elisabeth (Schonauegensis?) *Revelationes*.⁸

¹ *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae, Pars tertia, t. III* (Paris, 1744), p. 229.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 265.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 437.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pars tertia, t. IV (Paris, 1744), p. 110.

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, p. 141.

⁶ H. Omont, *Nouvelles acquisitions du département des manuscrits pendant les années 1900-1902* (Paris, 1903; extrait de la *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, t. LXIV), pp. 19-20.

⁷ *Catalogue général... Université de Paris et Universités des départements* (Paris, 1918), p. 198.

⁸ A. Poncelet, *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum bibliothecarum Romanarum praeterquam Vaticanarum* (Brussels, 1909 = *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXIV-XXVIII, Appendix), p. 387.

ST GALL, Stiftsbibliothek 591

Paper. s. XV. Poor Clares, Freiburg i. Br.
 pp. 1-161 Legend of the 11,000 Virgins, in German.
 pp. 162-259 *Revelatio de sacro exercitu*, etc., in German.¹

SOISSONS 222 (208)

Parchment. ff. 194 224 × 156 mm. s. XIV. Prémontré.
 (175 is double).
 f. 187^b Visions, in French.²

STAMS 19

Parchment. ff. 118. Quarto. s. XIII-XIV.
 ff. 91-109^v *Liber viarum Dei*.
 ff. 110-115^b *Epistolae*.³

(Subiaco 115

Paper. s. XV Segn. CXII.
 ff. 188 sqq. *Revelationes dominae nostrae factae beatae Elizabeth*.⁴)

VATICAN, Ross 3

s. XIV Carthusian convent near
 Valence.

Revelationes b. Elizabeth in Catalan.⁵

VOLTERRA 316 (5966)

s. XVI in.
 ff. 262-7 *Revelationes s. Helisabet ancille Christi*. Most of this MS. is in Italian.⁶

RUTH J. DEAN.

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.

¹ G. Scherrer, *Verzeichniss der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St Gallen* (Halle, 1875), p. 191.

² *Catalogue général* . . . III (Paris, 1885), p. 138.

³ *Xenia Bernardina*, II, 2 (Vienna, 1891), pp. 470-1.

⁴ G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia* (Forlì, 1890), p. 181.

⁵ Published by L. Ohgar in *Antonianum*, I, 1 (Rome, 1926); see notice in *Romana*, LII (1926), pp. 550-51, where the French version at Soissons, and Italian and Spanish versions of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, are also referred to.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, II (Forlì, 1892), p. 241.

H. W. VON GERSTENBERG AND GERMAN LITERATURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

It is now just ten years since Heinrich Meyer-Benfey stated the need for a new review of German Literature in the eighteenth century and he refers to H. W. v. Gerstenberg and his poetical and critical work in support of his demand.¹ The fact of Gerstenberg having been born two hundred years ago (January 3, 1737) may justify our attempting to examine what has been accomplished and what ought to have been accomplished during these ten years to smooth the way for a revised or profounder interpretation of that period.

Meyer-Benfey propounded his request at the very moment when three works were published devoted exclusively to the summing-up of eighteenth-century German Literature: Hermann Hettner's *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert* in a revised edition,² Albert Köster's posthumous work *Die deutsche Literatur der Aufklärungszeit*,³ and Ferdinand Joseph Schneider's *Deutsche Dichtung vom Ausgang des Barock bis zum Beginn des Klassicismus* (1700–85), forming vol. III of *Epochen der deutschen Literatur*, ed. by Julius Zeitler.⁴

These three works are, for very different reasons, altogether below the standard of knowledge even of the time when they appeared. Till then Meyer-Benfey's claim was well founded. Naturally this claim affects Hettner far less than the other two. Hettner's eminent work was written about ten years before the foundation of the German Reich, i.e. ten years before the beginning of the victorious career of the Scherer-school, whose officiousness and inanity reflect the work of Bismarck within the boundaries of the intellectual world. Indeed, Scherer's *Literaturgeschichte* was already dead before 1925, whereas the new edition of Hettner is a proof of his lasting freshness, even though he has been superseded in many respects. Hettner wrote 'Geistesgeschichte' a long time before it degenerated into a party cry. When, in the first decade of our century, the Alexandrian sentiment, whether feuilletonistic or philological, had caused an unparalleled decline of 'German Philology', it was above all Hettner's work that served as inspiration to the pioneers of a new conception of literary history. To-day that new conception has been realized to the

¹ *Zeitschrift für Hamburgische Geschichte*, 1926, p. 209.

² By Ewald Boucke, Braunschweig, 1925.

³ Heidelberg, 1925.

⁴ Stuttgart, 1924.

extent that 'Geisteswissenschaft' became Alexandrian not less than Philology did twenty-five years ago. And again Hettner is among those who show the way to escape from that new Alexandrian sentiment which in the philosophical sphere is less perceptible and therefore more dangerous than even the philological Alexandrian feeling of the past. Hettner's outlook is founded on philosophy and his survey is dominated by the development of philosophical ideas. That development is in his opinion more important than the specific task of an historian of literature, namely, showing how these ideas take on a literary and poetical form. But Hettner by no means neglects questions of an aesthetic kind, least of all in the way in which Scherer and his 'Literaturgeschichte' neglect ideas. It was necessary that after Gervinus and Hettner—the former was essentially a political historian, the latter by no means an unpolitical historian of ideas—the independence of Literary History should have been declared. The dictatorship, however, which Scherer exercised even after his death in this new autonomous realm was nothing but the rule of a specialization at bottom impotent and concerned therefore with maintaining the appearance of power. A specialization proud of its ability to relinquish, in contrast to Hettner, the essential point, and unaware, therefore, of its fundamental failure to promote the philological-aesthetic side by which it was eager to complete Hettner and to outdo him. The so-called 'geisteswissenschaftliche' history which to-day prevails in Germany does not derive from Hettner and his school but from renegades of the Scherer type. It was, therefore, unable to produce such a history of literature as Meyer-Benfey requires of it. Where it deals with other epochs the result is only to unmask its very nature, which is Gottsched writing like Lohenstein. In order to make them intelligible to scholars of other countries most of the books concerned¹ had to be translated into German. Commonplace embroidered with bombast is the opposite extreme to Hettner. Hettner understands thoroughly how to produce from his fundamental doctrine—the German 'Klassik' as the culmination of the Enlightenment—effect full of spirit and couched in a style which is as clear as it is vivid.

There is, however, a limit to everything. And the limitation of Hettner is the age to which he belongs. He wrote against Hegel and Romanticism as an adherent of the ideas of 1848. He had made up his mind to preserve European Liberalism, the very child of the Enlightenment, for his own time in order to let it enjoy an ever-increasing intellectual freedom, and

¹ E.g. Cysarz, *Von Schiller bis Nietzsche*, Halle, 1932; Hankamer, *Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock*, Stuttgart, 1935.

an ever purer humanity. Anyone thinking of Germany's intellectual life of to-day, to which 'leaders' of 'Germanistik'¹ succumbed even more quickly than the representatives of other branches of science, may perhaps understand Hettner's high praise of the classical humanism as a culmination of Rationalism, and not less his repudiation of every ecstasy, whether 'mystic' or 'romantic', which might be dangerous to his rationalistic ideal. But in the first place the rationalism of the nineteenth century so degenerates after Hettner's time that it produces, for instance, Scherer; and on the other hand the rationalism of the eighteenth century would never have produced the German classical age without anti-rational or at least irrational elements. Gerstenberg is the historical figure in whom we perceive the contrast of the two antagonistic elements as well as their amalgamation, i.e. the transition from one to the other. It is that transition which is so decisive in the development of the mid-eighteenth century period. Gerstenberg lived through nearly a century and the most important century of German literature. He has his source in the Enlightenment. He emanates from Gottsched. He becomes then, as a critic, the chief originator of the Storm and Stress, who has in all questions of a literary kind and *before* Herder a power of discernment whose importance for the development of the Seventies and for classical aesthetics can scarcely be overestimated. His interpretation of Shakespeare as strength and atmosphere (not only as a dramatist) created the German interpretation of Shakespeare *par excellence* and the doctrine of genius adhered to by the Storm and Stress. His lyrical poetry, Anacreontics and so-called 'Bardendichtung' form the very paragon of a literature between two ages. Schiller wrote to Goethe that one could use Gerstenberg's *Ugolino* 'um die Idee der Tragödie daran aufzuklären, weil wirklich die höchsten Fragen darin zur Sprache kommen'. Gerstenberg himself dealt with those 'höchsten Fragen' in connexion with Greek tragedy and with Aristotle, but this has, as yet, not fallen on good ground. Hettner has a better understanding of Gerstenberg than most other historians. But Gerstenberg is, on the other hand, rather a nuisance to him, because he—wrongly—believes him not to fit in with his idea of the development of rationalism. Remarkably enough, Hettner, the last historian of literature who strikes out new paths because his work springs from feeling for culture, 'Kulturgesinnung', does not see that the rationalism of the first half of the eighteenth century would in consequence of its ending in itself have destroyed any culture without Gerstenberg and his followers. Moreover, he does not see that in the sphere of dramatic

¹ E.g. an article by H. A. Korff in *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde*, May, 1933.

poetry *Ugolino* is the first step towards the classical drama that he himself celebrates as the most significant expression of the German mind. Hettner looks on Mysticism, Baroque, Storm and Stress and Romanticism almost as perversions. That is unhistorical and essentially wrong. And he has with regard to Gerstenberg the apparently ineradicable conviction that *Ugolino* gave the first impulse, by reason of its 'shapelessness', to the 'Scenenfetzen' which the Storm and Stress looked on as Shakespearian.

These brief remarks tend to show that the basis for a new account of eighteenth-century literature must be a history of the critical mind, a history of lyric and dramatic poetry. Gerstenberg belongs to the history of literature, because he belongs to those three departments of it. He, the man of transition, 'Übergangsnatur', makes perfectly clear what is deficient in our knowledge of the century. And because of each of the three departments we may find a connexion with the work of Hettner and the books of Köster and Schneider.

Hettner would have been essentially competent to carry forward the history of criticism further than he himself has done. He discusses the history of the most important ideas which accurately represent the Enlightenment, and he discusses them not as mere ideas but as ideas which have already received a poetical form. He has not yet the psychological, sociological and political basis for such a history—without which it remains of course a fragment. There is no discussion of the question: Germany and Europe in the province of mental culture. But even if Hettner had seen this question he would not have succeeded in interpreting it, because he explained the effect of the Storm and Stress as merely disintegrating, not building up. It is, however, precisely Gerstenberg who proves that the amalgamation of the European Enlightenment with the irrationalistic forces of the German Storm and Stress leads to the German classical age. It is, of course, nonsense to call—in direct contradiction to Hettner—Jean Paul 'more German' than Lessing (the consequence of any such distinctive Germanness which does not in reality exist would be to reject Jean Paul as not German because of his 'Jewish sarcasm'—and a German 'Studienrat' has, indeed, recently done so; there is no question but that Heine, who is and remains a German poet, is also the last German poet of Jean Paul's race). On the other hand it will not do to reject Jean Paul solely in order to show the direct descent of Goethe and Schiller from the Enlightenment and the degeneration of all that is not in this line. The critical output leading from the Enlightenment to the classical age comes from subjectivism, i.e. from the revolt of

the soul against the norm of the Enlightenment. To understand that development we have the works of Saintsbury and Braitmaier, which are indispensable even to-day. But both are too much mere histories of ideas, though more valuable than some recent writings wrongly celebrated as examples of historico-philosophical research. There are e.g. the essays of E. Ermatinger¹ and G. Müller² which purport to be comprehensive descriptions of the Enlightenment. Ermatinger, at least, is writing as an historian of literature. But he does not surpass what Koberstein already knew. Müller philosophizes with the ideas of others, but, sad to say, in his own language. The main thesis of his bloodless abstractions, that is, the thesis that the struggle of the Enlightenment for naturalness was directed less against artificiality than against supernaturalism, was answered before his article appeared.³ And Eugen Kühnemann has shown why that is impossible in his *Herder*, the most important example of a literary history which re-establishes the relations between ideas and life. We are willing to fall back on a book like E. Cassirer's *Philosophie der Aufklärung*. But we need more urgently a work dealing with German criticism which has its roots, not *in vacuo*, but in flesh and blood. The main point is not 'der konfuse Begriff' (Herder), even if it is not confused, but the reflection of the ideas of European thinkers and their independent transformation in the journals of the period. A. G. Baumgarten, to whom A. Riemann has devoted a valuable essay,⁴ must thus have less importance than the 'Bibliotheken' of Nicolai and his collaborators. They show the decisive evolution of the interpretation of the poetical genius—the central question of the whole epoch—better than any other authors and periodicals.⁵ There have appeared some books dealing with the development of the idea of genius during the time with which we are concerned (Zilsel, Rosenthal)⁶ but they result only in a collection of materials. Schlapp's *Kants Lehre vom Genie* is still the best monograph. Indispensable are the so-called 'Popularphilosophen', among whom are real creative critics (Zimmermann), who overthrow the conception which gave them their name and prepare the ground for the categorical criticism

¹ *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Kunde*, 1928.

² *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, VI, Freiburg, 1931.

³ A. M. Wagner, *Lessing*, Berlin und Leipzig, 1931.

⁴ *Die Aesthetik A. G. Baumgartens*, Bausteine, 21, Halle, 1928.

⁵ A beginning is the book: *Nicolaïs literarische Bestrebungen*, Haag, 1926, by F. C. A. Philips. Of no value whatever: G. Ost, *Fr. Nicolaïs Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*, Berlin, 1928, even from the standpoint of the author who desires to discover the collaborators of Nicolai.

⁶ E. Zilsel, *Versuch einer Geschichte des Geniebegriffs in der deutschen Ästhetik des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Heidelberg, 1923; B. Rosenthal, *Die Entstehung des Geniebegriffes. Ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte der Antike und des Frühkapitalismus*, Tübingen, 1926.

of the Storm and Stress. More important and more difficult in regard to the eighteenth century than to any other is the question what is in literature only fashion, what genius and formative power. This question has to cover all individual questions—method of criticism, the place of rules and the struggle against them, the relation to Shakespeare and antiquity, the conception of beauty and the kinds of poetry, etc. The dangerous temptation of tracing ‘influences’ has, during the time of Scherer, destroyed the scientific quality of literary history. The foreign mind plays a part in the history of a country because it helps it to become conscious of its own mind. We must refer to Young, who has for criticism before Goethe and Schiller far greater importance than Shaftesbury.

On the other hand, for the history of German lyric poetry, Young is not by far as essential as Ossian. The substantial point of that history is the evolution from ‘Rokoko’ and ‘Anakreontik’ to Klopstock. Nothing has been done with regard to it. A. Gillies has written a monograph on *Herder and Ossian*.¹ It is to be continued up to the Storm and Stress, and not only in respect of what its followers thought about Ossian but above all what they *did* with him. Again Gerstenberg is a symbol of the development. And in his *Minona* he has also, and in constant connexion with Ossian, answered the question what relation the German mind bears to the ideal of humanity. Köster is not sensible at all of the history of that question. Everywhere he discovers nothing but ‘Rokoko’ elements and, therefore, he belittles and narrows down the most creative era of German literary history. The author has been done no good service by the publication of this book. We have to find out whether lyric poetry before Klopstock, in spite of its connexion with the French Anacreontic, is striving after emancipation from all foreign models. On the other hand, E. v. Jan² has traced the ‘Rokoko’ still in Klopstock’s *Messias*. We must understand where is the earliest tendency towards an original lyrical poetry in the work of Hagedorn. Then it will be impossible to judge Gleim and Uz and Jacobi and Goetz by the same standard. We have to separate the Greek Anacreontic from the French and to understand that, for example, Uz is the creative and Gleim is the anacreontic poet *par excellence*, because he is only a skilful manufacturer of traditional forms and feelings. The antithesis to Hagedorn is Haller. The line leading from him to Klopstock is involved in obscurity. Already Haller carries the seeds of the mottoes of the Storm and Stress. Its poetry is the expression of its fate: it contends without success for the achievement of totality of

¹ Diss. Gottingen, 1933.

² *Das Stilelement des Rokoko in Klopstocks ‘Messias’*. *Die neueren Sprachen*, 1926, pp. 81 ff.

life (Haller) through form (Hagedorn). Some dissertations of Tübingen¹ deal with Hagedorn and Klopstock, apparently only to justify what has recently been said² about 'die völlige Entwertung des Dokortitels'. A Leipzig dissertation, however, by E. Kaussmann, *Der Stil der Oden Klopstocks* (1931), and remarks about Klopstock by R. Ibel³ are excellent models of interpretation, inasmuch as they consider the historical point of view as well as the æsthetic.

The merit of F. J. Schneider—in the third of the books mentioned—is that he widens our understanding of Klopstock by comparing him with the expressionism of our century. The idea is essentially important with regard to Klopstock, the *dramatist*. The history of German dramatic poetry has not been furthered for years. Indeed, E. Dollinger⁴ tries to prove that Klopstock's *Tod Adams* is prefigurative of Gerstenberg's *Ugolino*. But his book contains only unessential things. The 'höchsten Fragen' which Schiller would like to discern in *Ugolino* are concerned with the struggle of the German drama between form and stress. Klopstock's *Tod Adams* overpowers the logical drama. German drama develops with the discussions about Greek and Roman drama, about Shakespeare and the heroic French tragedy, not looked at from the point of Gottsched.⁵ Gerstenberg's *Ugolino* is the symbolic expression of those discussions. The essential task of the Germanist, therefore, is the account of its principal stages. We have again to examine the relation of German poetry and German drama to Corneille and Racine on the one hand and on the other to Sophocles, Euripides and Shakespeare. It is only then possible to begin to see clearly the relation of Schiller's tragedy to the philosophy of Kant.⁶

ALBERT MALTE WAGNER.

LONDON.

¹ G. Schuchardt, *Studien zur Verskunst des jungen Klopstock*, 1926; K. Epting, *Der Stil Hagedorns*, 1929.

² Alfred Bergmann, *G.R.M.*, 1934, p. 253; cf. A. M. Wagner, *Literaturblatt für Germanische und Romanische Philologie*, 1918, 5/6.

³ *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, LIV, 359 ff.

⁴ Halle, 1930. H. Pyritz, *Jahresberichte*, 1930 (Berlin), 1933, is wrong in saying that it was Saran who discovered the relations between the two plays.

⁵ E. Kriessbach, *Die Trauerspiele in Gottscheds Deutscher Schaubühne (Hermæa, XIX)*, as well as O. Francke, *Euripides bei den deutschen Dramatikern des 18. Jahrhunderts (Das Erbe der Alten, 2. Reihe, Heft 16)*, Leipzig, 1929, do not see the difference between the Gottschedian interpretation of French tragedy and its real nature.

⁶ Very valuable as regards this question: H. Kelsen, *Die philosophischen Grundlagen der Naturrechtslehre und des Rechtspositivismus*, Berlin, 1928.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

A NOTE ON 'CRIST', Line 20

Line 20 of the *Crist* has been read by all the editors till now as *eadza us sizes, oþrum forwyrned* (see Grein-Wülcker's *Bibliothek*, Cook's *Christ*).

In the Introduction to the facsimile of the *Exeter Book* Professor R. W. Chambers transcribes the line as 'eadz(a) us sizes oþrum forwyrned'.

Fortunately, an ultra-violet photograph of this obscure folio (8a), which Professor Chambers and Dr A. H. Smith have kindly provided, throws much light on the actual reading, and what was till now transcribed as *us sizes* appears really to be *upwezas*, for these reasons:

(1) The first letter *u* is quite clear. (2) The second can hardly be *s*, for, although there is the top horizontal curve, this descends on the right more than the stroke of *s* or *f* does; there is also part of a horizontal stroke below this; the letter would therefore seem to be *p* with part of the bow destroyed. (3) The third letter has a top stroke similar to *s*; but usually in *s*, *f*, and *p*, but not in *w*, this top stroke is attached to the descender in such a way as to make the clubbing at the top of the descender appear forked; in this letter, however, there is no such fork, and we should therefore take it as *w* with part of the bow destroyed. (4) The fourth letter is evidently a tall *e* with the left part of the top loop destroyed. (5) The fifth letter is *z*, as all editors agree. (6) The sixth letter is the *Exeter Book* flat-topped *a* with the bottom serif quite visible; there is a small diagonal stroke inside the letter, but, as such a stroke is unknown in any other letter, it is certainly to be regarded as a blemish. (7) The seventh letter is *s* with the top stroke as in (3). There appears to be a middle horizontal stroke, but it is too close to the top stroke for *f*. The idea of its being *p* is also obviated by the top stroke coming to a decidedly marked point as in *s*.

Again, in *forwyrned* the last letter seems really to be *ð*, for the cross-mark seems visible, though rather indistinct. The word should therefore be read as *forwyrneð*, as by Grein.

With regard to 'eadz(a)', Professor Chambers seems to be in doubt as to the reading of the *a*. The letter seems to me more like *u* than *a*, for it seems to be quite open at the top like *u*, and there is a serif on the left as in *u*. The letter is probably *u*.

Immediately after this letter a portion of the folio seems to have been cut off. Gollancz says: 'After *za*, which comes at the end of the line, a

small piece of parchment has been cut out: at most one letter could have been on it, but probably none at all.' I think that probably we have lost the letter *m*, for the word *oþrum* would normally be accompanied by a correlative expressed by some other substantive, adjective or pronoun; it is difficult to regard *eadza* as any part of a verb, as is usually supposed. I would prefer, therefore, to read *eadzum*, taking the word as correlative to *oþrum*. For the sense we may compare *eadize on upwez* Andr. 830 a, *eadiz on upwez* Gu. 1280 a, Gu. 1340.

My reading of l. 20 is therefore *eadzu(m) upwezas, oþrum forwyrneð*. This leads us to a new rendering of ll. 18–21, which now read

Eala þu reccend	Ʒ þu riht cyninƷ,
se þe locan healdeð	lif ontyneð
eadzu(m) upwezas,	oþrum forwyrneð
wlitizan wilsipes	Ʒif his weoro ne deaƷ!

O Thou Ruler and just king, (the one) who keeps the key, opens Life, the ways of Heaven, to the blessed one, denies the welcome journey to another if his (the latter's) deeds are not good!

Two points should be noted. The first is the change from second to third person in the relative clauses of an invocation. The other is the question of number in *eadzum*, *oþrum* and *his*. The simplest way is to regard *eadzum*, *oþrum* as singular in form; but if they are plural (as we should expect), then we should translate 'the blessed people', 'the rest'; *his* then implies that *oþrum* at any rate was regarded as collective, and as frequently happens with collective words the number of dependent words varies sometimes with grammar, sometimes with sense (cp., for example, *Crist*, ll. 385–6 with 395–6).

S. K. DAS.

DACCA.

'SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT', Line 2511

For non may hyden his harme but unhap ne may hit.
For none may conceal his misfortune but unfasten not may it.

Suggested emendation:

For mon may hyden his harme but unhap ne may hit.
For one may conceal his misfortune but unfasten not may it.

Gawain had let himself be misled by the Green Knight's lady, and returning to court decided always to wear the girdle which had figured in his downfall (mere conversion to his own use of the girdle). He makes a kind of metaphor of it. The girdle will always be with him like his shame.

To read:

'For one (mon) [none (non)] may hide his shame but may not be freed from it.'

The reading in square brackets does not make sense to me. The 'n' for 'm' occurs also in l. 2240 ('welcon' for 'welcom'), and in l. 1037 ('nerci' for 'merci'), and in l. 865 ('hyn' for 'hym').

Note also 'm' for 'n', l. 2131 ('mot' for 'not'), 'm' for 'n', l. 1810 ('tyme' for 'tyne'), 'nn' for 'm', l. 1690 ('nnorsel' for 'morsel').

If errors are made with 'n' and 'm' where obvious nonsense results ('welcon', etc.), are they not much more likely to occur where the wrong spelling *still* makes a real word and indeed a word that makes sense until one reaches the middle of the line?

L. M. PERRY.

NORTH AUCKLAND, N.Z.

AN UNRECOGNIZED EDITION OF NICHOLAS BRETON

The four-leaf fragment of black-letter verse listed in the *Short-Title Catalogue* under the ghost-title '[Tarltons toyes of an idle head]'¹ has induced at least two persons to make special visits to the Cambridge University Library to inspect an imaginary Tarlton rarity. Fortunately the library had other treasures to appease their annoyance when they discovered the blunder. The *Short-Title Catalogue* adopted the error from Charles E. Sayle's invaluable Cambridge catalogue, with only a wary and incomplete reference to Sayle's subsequent correction.² As Sayle recognized, the fragment comes from an edition of Nicholas Breton's *A Floorish vpon Fancie*, the second part of which has the title *The Toyes of an Idle Head*. Sayle naturally assumed that the fragment was from the 1577 or the 1582 edition. Since the only copy of 1577 is in the Huntington Library, and the 1582 edition is known only from copies at the British Museum and the Bodleian, bibliographers have not noticed that the Cambridge fragment actually represents an unrecognized third edition.

With the problem simplified by photostats, comparison of the Cambridge fragment and the British Museum copy of 1582 shows that one is a page-for-page reprint of the other, but neither follows the page arrangement of 1577. Closer agreement with the text of 1577 is shown by the 1582 edition; the Cambridge fragment accordingly represents a third edition of uncertain date. The Cambridge leaves differ from the 1582 edition in as many as fifty minute details to the page, mostly changes in

¹ Entry 23,687.

² *Early English Printed Books in the University Library, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1900-1907), original description at i, 293, correction at iv, 61 and 337.

spelling and punctuation. The editions may be easily distinguished by their running titles, as follows:

	Verso	Recto
1577	The toyes of an Idle head.	The toyes of an Idle head.
1582	THE TOYES	OF AN IDLE HEAD.
Frag.	THE TOYES OF	AN IDLE HEAD.

The rare verbal variants may be illustrated by the title to the poem which appears in 1577 at sig. O2, and in 1582 at L4v. The Cambridge fragment reads: '¶ Another Toy written in the praise of a Gilliflower, at the request of a Gentlewoman, and one aboue the rest, who loued that flower.' The earlier editions read correctly, 'of Gentlewomen'. The Cambridge fragment corresponds to signatures L4, K2, K3, and L1 of the 1582 edition. Like the earlier editions, it was doubtless printed by Richard Jones. Ignoring the printer, its proper listing in the *Short-Title Catalogue* follows:

3655 a—[Anr. ed.] 4^o. C. (4 leaves only).

Meanwhile the problem of *Tarlton's Toys*, whatever the nature of that lost book, remains unsolved. The existence of the book is demonstrated both by its entry in the Stationers' Register on 10 December 1576, a few months before the entry of Breton's work, and by contemporary allusions. No copy or fragment is now known. One reference to the book associates it curiously with the Breton volume. In his epistle before Samuel Daniel's translation of *The Worthy tract of Paulus Iouinus*, 1585, N. W. declares that Daniel's work is not 'a florish vpon fancie, or *Tarletons* toyes, or the sillie Enterlude of *Diogenes*'. Were it not impossible to associate the aridity of Breton's early verse with the broad humour of the famous clown, one might conjecture that Breton's *Toyes* were popularly known as *Tarlton's*. Two later references to *Tarlton's Toys* refer possibly to his stage antics rather than to the book. In *A Health to the Gentlemanly profession of Seruingmen*, 1598, I. M. states (sig. B3) that 'the Clowne, the Slouen, and Tom althummes, are as farre vnfit for this profession, as *Tarletons* toyes for *Paules* Pulpit'. In *The Terrors of the night*, 1594, Nashe remarks that '*Martin Momus* and spleaiefooted *Zoylus*, that in the eight and sixt age of Poetrie and first yere of the reigne of *Tarltons* toies, kept a foule stir in *Poules* Church-yard, are now reuiued againe'.¹

FRANKLIN B. WILLIAMS, JR.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

¹ R. B. McKerrow ed., *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, i, 343. In his note on this obscure passage (iv, 199), McKerrow identifies the *toies* with the lost book.

FRENCH 'ICIL'

In *Language*, XII, 48, M. A. Pei objects to the derivation of French *icil* from *ecce ille*, and proposes to explain it as coming from *hic ille* treated as a single word. His discussion shows an amazing disregard of phonologic principles. He assumes that the treatment of *k* in *oil* < *hoc ille* differed from that in *hic ille* because of the preceding velar vowel. But *oil* is simply a French word-group, made up of French *o* and *il*. From *oiseau*, *cuisine*, *luisant*, *plaisir*, *loisir*, *disait*, it is clear that a palatalized *k* developed alike after all vowels. From these same words it is clear that *hic ille* should have made a form with *dz* and later *z* (voiced *s*), not one with *ts* and the later voiceless *s* found in *icil*.

From the evidence of the oldest French texts, it seems that *cil* is older than *icil*. It is possible that appearances are misleading: perhaps *icil* is really the older form, but was not at first accepted as suitable for writing. But in either case the explanation of *icil* seems clear. If *cil* < *ecce ille* is the older form, *icil* is a French word-group, with French *i* prefixed to *cil*. If *icil* is older than *cil*, it represents a blending of *i* **ecil*, with absorption of weak-stressed *e* by the more strongly stressed *i*. For the general sense, there are well known parallels in Rumanian *acela* (-*a* < *hac*), French *ceci*, *cela*, and vulgar English *this here thing*, *that (th)ere thing*.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

EDITORIAL NOTE

The Editors intend, from time to time, to publish in the *Modern Language Review* approved articles of more than average length, in special enlarged numbers, with assistance from University Publications Funds or from other sources. They hope to meet in this way the need for a medium for scholarly work on a larger scale, which could not be included in ordinary numbers of the journal. The present issue of the *Review*, while containing the usual number of articles of normal length and of reviews, has been augmented in this manner by Dr Weevers' article on 'Vondel's Influence on German Literature'. The April number will include Professor Kastner's concluding 'Notes on the Poems of Bertran de Born', and other enlarged numbers have already been arranged for.

C. J. SISSON,
General Editor

REVIEWS

- Lydgate's Troy Book*. Edited by HENRY BERGEN. Part IV: Bibliographical Introduction, Notes, Glossary and Index. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. (E.S. CXXVI.) 1935. vi+572 pp. 15s.
- Speculum Sacerdotale*. Edited by EDWARD H. WEATHERLY. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. (O.S. 200.) 1936. xlv+292 pp. 16s.
- Knyghthode and Bataile*. Edited by R. DYBOSKI and Z. M. AREND. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. (O.S. 201.) 1936. lxxvi+205 pp. 16s.
- Mum and Sothsegger*. Edited by MABEL DAY and ROBERT STEELE. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. (O.S. 199.) 1936. xlv+164 pp. 12s.

The fourth and final volume of *Lydgate's Troy Book*, for which through unavoidable circumstances we have had to wait so long, is especially welcome. Dr Bergen has now given us a completely revised Bibliographical Introduction which is intended to supersede the previous draft published as early as 1903, though reference will still need to be made to that sketch in the matter of variant readings. He has now given us a complete and authoritative account of the nineteen manuscripts, several of which were unknown to him in 1903, and has discussed with scholarly acumen the relations of the manuscripts and prints. The main things in the volume are, however, the promised notes on Guido delle Colonne's *Historia Troiana* which had to wait until the publication of Part IV of the *Fall of Princes*, and the Glossary; in addition there are a few notes on Lydgate's text and a final Index of Names. The Glossary has been based throughout on the Oxford Dictionary and was on that account delayed until the publication of the dictionary had been completed. There are naturally numerous instances in which the *Troy Book* forestalls the earliest entry in the Oxford Dictionary. A glossary of such dimensions, running to over three hundred pages, calls for infinite care and patience, but the labour has been worth while, for Dr Bergen has recorded in almost every case contextual meanings, so that, apart from a study of the text of the *Troy Book*, the work will be invaluable to the student of fifteenth-century English and particularly to an editor of an Early Modern English Dictionary. This is a monumental piece of work for which we are grateful, but why omit all etymologies?

Dr Weatherly's edition of *Speculum Sacerdotale*, an interesting fifteenth-century collection of *sermones de tempore et de sanctis* of the same type as Mirk's *Festial*, will be of great interest to those who have studied Dr Owst's works on preaching in Medieval England. The editing has been

most painstaking and successful in method. The notes, of necessity strictly limited in number, are very helpful and should direct the reader to the available Latin sources and parallels. The glossary, one would imagine, is primarily intended for the student who is not very familiar with Middle English, and rightly makes no attempt to record etymologies. It does, however, make mention of cases where the word is not recorded in the Oxford Dictionary or at a much later period, a point that might be copied by all future editors of fifteenth-century texts. The Introduction gives us all that we could reasonably ask for, such as an account of the manuscript, the language, an analysis of the scope and content of the work, an enquiry into the sources and a brief study of the book in relation to contemporary church writings. All this is adequate and a stimulus to further study.

Knyghthode and Bataile is a fifteenth-century verse paraphrase by a priest of Calais of Flavius Vegetius Renatus's treatise *De Re Militari*, the well-known work on the state of the Imperial Army in the third quarter of the fourth century. The interest of the poem lies in the topical allusions, and the editors have done much to elucidate the problems which are thus raised. They conclude that the date of composition was 1458/9, and that the author was an enthusiastic Lancastrian. The critical apparatus is adequate, and the section dealing with 'Military Terms' is especially to be commended to the student of vocabulary.

It is now eight years since the manuscript of *Mum and Sothsegger* was discovered, and in the interval Dr Day and Mr Steele have been engaged on the task of editing the work. Dr Day has brought to the task her intimate knowledge of alliterative poetry and with the help of Mr Steele has given us a worthy edition. Both fragments of the poem are printed (which was surely the right procedure whether we accept the unity of authorship or not), so that comparison is rendered easy. The editors have made no attempt to underestimate the differences between the earlier and later fragment, and the present reviewer feels inclined to accept their cautious conclusions. The *passus* arrangement in *Richard the Redeles* they account for as scribal, which in view of the evidence seems exceedingly likely. The scope of this review does not permit of detailed comment, but there is no likelihood that such an important publication will escape the attention of any serious student of Middle English literature. The study of the metre and language is very detailed and trustworthy, and the problem of date is thoroughly investigated. The notes are relevant and helpful, embodying much original research into obscure points. In dealing with a volume such as this, one hesitates to grumble at minor details, but it is surely not unfair to suggest that in a poem of this sort (which would form an excellent set book for the student) etymologies should be given systematically, not spasmodically. Why give the etymology of *cristen* and not of *luggid*? Nevertheless we are deeply indebted to the editors for their care and patience; they have given us everything really needful.

J. P. OAKDEN.

Peter Idley's Instructions to his Son. Edited with Introduction and Notes by CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN. Boston: D. C. Heath; London: H. Milford. 1935. vii + 240 pp. 11s. 6d.

This is a strenuous, textually accurate and on the whole well-proportioned edition of a mid-fifteenth-century text, of which only brief extracts have so far appeared in print, and of the author of which nothing was known except the name and one or two details deducible from the poem itself.

In ch. I of the Introduction Miss D'Evelyn identifies the *Petrus Idle armiger* of the Latin Preface with the *Petrus Idle de Drayton in comitatu Oxonie armiger* whose brass was formerly in Dorchester Abbey Church, and recovers by patient combing of State Papers and local archives the public and private life of this Peter Idle. The documents allow us to guess at a character practical, homely and sagacious and at a position of sober responsibility rather than distinction. The frequency with which his name occurs in legal documents in conjunction with Redes, Marmions, Stonors and Quatermains shows the circle in which he moved. In ch. II the dependence of the *Instructions* on its sources is discussed and illustrated with a judicious refusal to claim too much independence for this didactic parent. In ch. III, after a brief paragraph on the date and a too summary account of the dialectal evidence, the seven MSS. are described and their interrelation established by full and intricate argument; the selection for this edition of the *E* MS. as, on the whole, the best choice out of seven evils is convincingly supported.

When it came to the question of the treatment of the text, the editor was faced with the always difficult problem of where to draw the line in editorial handling. No one is likely to complain of the principles on which emendation of the *E* text has been admitted, and not many of the expansion (in italics) of the usual MS. contractions. The inclusion of a select, rather than a complete, collation may appear more debatable, but the heterogeneous and largely insignificant mass of variants offered by the MSS. will make this seem to most a reasonable compromise between the abstract perfection of scholarly fullness and the practical limits of a book. I find more difficult to justify the elimination of the original metrical pointing within the line and the imposition of modern punctuation. The text is thus, of course, made more 'readable', but the *Instructions* is most likely to be used by specialists, and to those who might have turned to it for evidence as to mid-fifteenth-century prosody and 'rethorike' (including sentence structure) its usefulness is greatly impaired.

The most questionable feature of the edition, however, is the excessive and unnecessary anxiety Miss D'Evelyn shows to separate the 'Peter Idle Esquire of Kent' whom Stow deduced from the MSS.¹ from her Oxfordshire candidate.

In the Latin Preface to the *Instructions* the author describes himself as

¹ In MS. Harley 172 (*H*) the name occurs as a note in Stow's handwriting. As in this MS. the names are omitted from the Latin preface and there is no Book II (and therefore no allusion to Kent) Stow's note must be based on his knowledge of other versions.

Petrus Idle armiger and gives his son's name as Thomas. In Bk. II (A. 1425) he writes disarmingly

And thoughe myn Englysshe be symple to your entent
Haue me excused—I was born in Kent.

In spite of two incontrovertible statements on p. 3—that to be born in Kent does not commit one to Kent for life and that the couplet suggests an environment no longer Kentish—Miss D'Evelyn proceeds to whittle away the Kentish connexions of her author. By a quotation from *How the Plowman learned his Paternoster* and from Caxton's well-known reference (Preface to the *Recuyell*) to his native speech 'lernte in Kent in the weelde', she endeavours to prove that Kent was a byword for boorish speech, and that 'I was born in Kent' was accepted as meaning 'I don't speak the best English'. If so, then this implication should have been clearer to Stow than it is to us, but very definitely it was not.

Later, Miss D'Evelyn brushes aside the dialectal evidence. It is true that in MSS. of this character and date it would be vain to look for consistency and a clear lead, yet if evidence is provided it must be reckoned with. On her own showing (pp. 58–60) the principal dialectal features are consistent with a strong original south-eastern colouring (e.g., the coalescence of O.E. \bar{a}^1 , \bar{a}^2 , and \bar{y} in $[\bar{e}]$), while there is nothing that demands an Oxfordshire provenance. However much the original dialectal basis has been overlaid and confused by scribes, there remain the rhymes, and a study of these would, without a word from the author, lead us to look for him in the south-east area, most probably in Kent.

Finally, on this subject, though the name Idle(y) is not easy to come by in early records, it is well authenticated for Kent from Domesday Book onwards. Moreover, in records approaching Idley's dates the names Peter, William and John are found, though not all together, and it is not without significance (common as the names are) that the same Christian names are perpetuated in the family of Peter Idley of Drayton. On the other hand, there is nothing to show that Idley was an Oxfordshire name before the Idley-Drayton family emerges in the latter half of the fifteenth century.¹

The statements quoted above from p. 3 perhaps indicate that Miss D'Evelyn is quite prepared to regard her Peter Idley as a migrant from Kent to Oxfordshire, but she does not definitely say so, and her handling of the dialect and statements like the first sentence on p. 4² seem to show that she wants, in the interests of her Oxfordshire candidate, to cut away all Kentish ground from under Idley's feet. But this zeal is superfluous, for the hypothesis of a Kentish Peter Idley (perhaps a younger son) who, through marriage with a Drayton heiress, became a man of sub-

¹ Documents such as the *Boarstall Cartulary* enable one to trace back most of the names grouped with Idley's (such as Rede and Marmion) for generations. Behind the Idley name there lies no such local tradition. The lack of early evidence for the family in Oxfordshire also emerged from Mr C. St John Brooke's researches into the Drayton family (see his letter to the *Times Literary Supplement*, 12 September 1935).

² 'But the very absence of any satisfactory evidence connecting "Peter Idle" with Kent removes the chief obstacle in the way of identifying him with a Peter Idley of Oxfordshire frequently mentioned in fifteenth-century records.'

stance in Oxfordshire, won a respected place among the established families and witnessed their deeds, and who, when he came to turn author, used as *basis* the speech-type he had been brought up to—such a hypothesis fits the data before us far more naturally and convincingly than that of an unprecedented Idley growing, like Topsy, out of the Oxfordshire soil. The lack of early documentation for the name in Oxfordshire should at least have been admitted whatever view Miss D'Evelyn holds.

A few additions and corrections may be noted. The *Nivalma* written in MS. A opposite one signature of R. Englysshe (copier of the MS.) may plausibly be identified with *New Elme* (Ewelme), and thus, since the Englishes were an Oxfordshire family, may lend some support to the view that the copyist is at least connected with the Richard English who witnesses documents together with Redes, Marmions and other members of the Idley group. There are a few printer's errors: for example, p. 8 n. 46, p. 66 n. 24. The reversed values of the 'digraphs' on p. 59 are either a printer's confusion or a phonological misstatement: *leede* (Bk. 1, l. 2) goes back to O.E. \tilde{a}^2 , *dede* to \tilde{a}^1 .

The book is excellently produced in a type and format both attractive and practical. Neither Idley's life nor his book had any striking role to play in history or letters, but each, as patiently elucidated in this edition, has its ray of light to shed on the manners, ideas, language and literary influences of a very dim and still poorly regarded century.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

The Vulgaria of John Stanbridge and the Vulgaria of Robert Whittinton.

Edited with an Introduction and Notes by BEATRICE WHITE.
London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1932. lxi+146 pp. 12s.

The methods of teaching Latin in English schools underwent an important change at the end of the fifteenth century, when the principle of using English as a vehicle for instruction was introduced. The credit for this seems to belong to John Anwykyll, Informator of Magdalen School (founded in the mid-fifteenth century) from c. 1481-7, whose Latin-English phrase-book, *Vulgaria quedam abs Terentio in Anglicam linguam traducta*, was the forerunner of many grammar books, vocabularies and lists of everyday phrases with the Latin and English parallel. Anwykyll's successor at Magdalen School, John Stanbridge (1488-94), was the author of a popular Latin-English vocabulary (with the Latin arranged in hexameters for easier memorizing), to which was added, by Stanbridge or a reviser, a large collection of easy and topical sentences and phrases. Stanbridge's method was adopted at St Paul's School and elsewhere under the influence of John Holt, Thomas Wolsey, William Lily, and other pupils of Magdalen School, and was continued in this school by Robert Whittinton, who was noted not only for his large output of books on grammar and of translations from Cicero and Seneca, but also for his savage skill in controversy and invective.

Beatrice White has reprinted from the editions of Wynkyn de Worde the *Uulgaria Stanbrigiana* (1519) and the *Uulgaria Roberti Whittintoni* (1520), apparently from copies in the Huntington Library (the reproductions of the title-pages are from such copies), prefacing them with a general account of the early Tudor grammarians, and of the aims and methods of teaching Latin, spoken and written, in the early sixteenth century. Of the two books Stanbridge's is the less interesting. As has been said, this consists of a classified vocabulary and a collection of colloquial phrases, many of them referring to the scholastic methods and manners of the day ('The mayster gaue me a blowe on the cheke'; 'the latyn is full of fautes'; 'the chyldren be sterynge about in the maistres absence'; 'I am as good as y^e in grammer'; 'Wolde god we myght go to playe'). Whittinton's book supplies grammatical and syntactical 'precepts', with numerous examples, often in connected prose, ingeniously chosen to illustrate them, and in many cases 'authorities' from classical writers. Apart from its (for the time) good arrangement and usefulness as a school text-book, it cannot but impress us for the light it sheds incidentally on personalities, events and customs of the day: on Henry VII, on Linacre ('He is depely experite in greke tongue soo that dyuerse men iudge that ther is smal difference bytwene Erasmus and hym', 105), on Thomas More ('Moore is a man of an aungels wyt & syngler lernyng. . . . And as tyme requyreth a man of merueylous myrth and pastymes & somtyme of as sad grauyte as who say. a man for all seasons', 64); on life at Oxford ('Whan I was a scholer of Oxforthe I lyued competently with .vij. pens commens wekely', 65); on the trades of the city, of which Whittinton gives a long list; on the rotting heads and limbs on London Bridge; on the coming of ambassadors from France and Castile ('And all the commens of London resorted strete by strete to salute them and welcom them', 69); on food prices; on 'fryed egges and bakon' for breakfast; on printing, the 'Italian' pronunciation of Latin, the value of the English vernacular; on manners at court ('He must fyrst applye hymselfe to agre with all maner of persones. to cory fauell craftely to daunse attendaunce at all houres to be seruyable', etc., 83). Whittinton finally gives instructions for the behaviour of teachers and pupils in school, and, in the manner of the courtesy books, of boys when waiting or sitting at table.

The editor supplies, without bibliographical details, a list of the works of Stanbridge and Whittinton, but unfortunately 'a complete Bibliography . . . has yet to be attempted'. It is to be regretted that no comment is made on such grammatical, phonological and syntactical features as are worth noting, as for instance the preterite *clunged*, the spelling *slype* 'sleep', and the tendency to metathesis (*a thruste*, *clapse*, *gyrdyron*).

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

LONDON.

The Enchanted Glass: the Elizabethan Mind in Literature. By HARDIN CRAIG. New York and London: Oxford University Press. 1936. ix+293 pp. 10s. 6d.

The subject of this book is Elizabethan mentality as moulded by the culture of the sixteenth century and expressed in Elizabethan literature. 'It is not possible', asserts the author,

to revivify literature without a knowledge of the mind that produced it. (P. 184.) Those who believe that the poet and the literary genius are independent of time, place, and social circumstances and that a God to whom present, past, and future are as one, does actually and directly speak to and through poets and reveal to them truth and beauty—those holding such doctrines will see no occasion for these remarks. (P. 62.)

His premiss is indisputable, and the line of research it has prompted very fruitful. For perspective is a necessary preliminary to any form of historical criticism, and on this account the Elizabethan era of creative activity, with its violent prejudices and strange inconsistencies, presents peculiar difficulties. The Age of Bardolatry has gone: but the sense of values is no less defective when distaste for the close-up induces over-specialization upon details of background to the obscuring of the whole scene.

Professor Craig is saved from this danger by his object and method. Since literature is the expression of mind, external circumstances can affect it only through the medium of mind; thus the significance of allusions lies not in the recorded detail but in the reaction of the recorder, not in specific references by Shakespeare or Jonson to politics or alchemy, but in their attitudes to the subjects in question. To decide this it is necessary to explore the group-mentality of their age as reflected in the different spheres of religion, science, education, politics and psychology. Exhaustive treatment of so vast a theme is manifestly beyond the scope of this short study; but the author may justly claim to have indicated the lines which such an investigation should follow and to have duly stressed the chief landmarks of the course.

The compiler of a general map of man during the sixteenth century is inevitably laid under obligation to Bacon, who supplies a title and prefatory quotation pertinent to each chapter. From a preliminary survey of the universal nature of things, of man as he conceived himself to be in relation to the cosmos, the author pursues his subject in the light of evidence afforded by sixteenth-century views upon natural science, religion and astrology (chapters I-III), in each of which error and superstition, as effective forces in literature, prove to be no less significant than established truth, being equally concerned with the one underlying subject, man. The combating of error through the advancement of learning and education, particularly in logic and rhetoric, forms the subject of the next four chapters. The evidence thus adduced, substantiated by our knowledge of Elizabethan life and letters, leads to the conclusion that 'the mind of the Renaissance moved habitually on a conceptual rather than a rational level', a fact that would account for many fundamental points of difference between Elizabethan literature and that of to-day.

To determine the nature of this contrast between the two ages is one of Professor Craig's main objectives; but he has wisely kept it in the back-

ground by treating his subject retrospectively, resisting the temptation to establish fanciful contacts with modern thought. Notwithstanding all that has been written on the general and particular influence of individual authors—Plato, Aristotle, Cicero or Seneca—much still remains to be explored concerning the relation of Elizabethan intellectualism to that of antiquity as well as of the Middle Ages; and for this purpose Professor Craig's estimate of comparative indebtedness to the classics, the schoolmen and contemporary humanists clears considerable ground. He throws new light upon the strictly logical bases of Puritanism as formulated by Calvin and assigns due importance to more obscure writers like Robert Fludd and Robert Recorde.

A natural corollary to Professor Craig's synthesis is its application to general literature, particularly to drama, the most sensitive reflector of contemporary mentality. Thus the universal preference of conceptual to actual values during the Elizabethan era goes far to explain the predominance of convention in poetry, romance and characterization in general. The mental attitude and equipment deduced from the evidence of formal and technical commentary renders possible some systematizing of Elizabethan psychology as reflected in the drama, a subject commonly misrepresented through the inadequate consideration of relevant data; in the light of these conclusions Marlowe acquires added significance as a pioneer, Shakespeare as a genius in the presentation of conflicting passions and Chapman as a pedant indulging his taste for psychological terminology to such an extent that 'one could almost reconstruct the subject of Elizabethan psychology from his plays alone'. Further, the treatment of literature as an evolutionary mental phenomenon serves to explain the contrast between the age of Sidney and that of Jonson and Burton, the vogue of humours appearing not as a sudden turn of fashion but as the logical development of ideas deep seated in Elizabethan consciousness.

The cross currents of thought during an age of such many-sided activity as the Renaissance are exceedingly elusive, and in a brief study on the subject some repetition is inevitable. Though the general claim to novelty is amply justified, it is now late in the day to speak of the *accepted opinion* 'that the English Renaissance was a period during which for once the *joie de vivre* was universal'. The discursive method of treatment tends in places to obscure the main argument. But this method should attract a considerable number of readers who might be intimidated by a more compendious treatise. *The Enchanted Glass* may be recommended both as a work of intrinsic interest and as a stimulus to further study upon many different aspects of the theme.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

The Works of Edmund Spenser. A Variorum Edition. Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, C. G. OSGOOD and F. M. PADELFORD. Vol. IV. RAY HEFFNER, Special Editor. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1935. xiv + 538 pp. 27s.

Spenser's Theory of Friendship. By CHARLES G. SMITH. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1935. viii + 74 pp. 6s.

These two books may well be reviewed together, for there is evidently some relationship between them, as between earlier volumes of the Variorum Edition and other publications of the same kind. It looks as if studies of special points were arranged for, published, and then excerpted into the Variorum. The procedure is both curious and cumbrous, and if (in this case) Professor Smith made his studies *ad hoc*, he might as well have published his conclusions in the relevant Variorum volume, in a form more readable and more workmanlike than a series of quotations. It might be alleged that a Variorum Edition is *ex hypothesi* composed of quotations. So much the worse for Variorum Editions.

The Fourth Book of *The Faerie Queene* cannot but receive somewhat desultory comment, since its plan and conduct are themselves desultory. Spenser evidently began with a double idea: to finish the Squire's Tale, and to illustrate Friendship. But the Squire's Tale is a yarn, and yarning was neither Spenser's forte nor his intention: the Heroic Poem is a different thing, and on the wrong scale. Friendship, again, is a simple virtue. Dr Smith has carefully studied the literature, and cites the precedents that form the familiar tradition of phrases and notions; it would have strengthened his book if he had cited also the abundant evidence for Spenser's personal loyalty. That would have meant inventing a new line of approach, but it would have been worth it. There is really not enough in Friendship to make out a whole Book of philosophic complexity. On the other hand, it is closely allied to Love, a subject of such vast complexity that Book III could not contain it all. The literary and the philosophic motive thus failed, and meanwhile Spenser was left with a number of loose ends (both literary and philosophic) from Book III, which he could quite plausibly tuck away in the Book of Friendship.

The interest of the commentary lies then in the treatment of the episodes, and most of all in the great set pieces, the fulfilment of the old ambition of *Epithalamion*, *Thamesis* and the parallel sea-symphony of Marinell's wedding, and the Temple of Venus. Of the first let it suffice to say that Dr Osgood's *Spenser's English Rivers* and Joyce's *Irish Rivers* are more useful in their original form, and that quotation from Miss Spens's fine chapter in her *Spenser's Faerie Queene* merely sends one back to the original. As for the Temple of Venus, Spenser confused himself between Friendship and Love—Society and Life—ethics and speculation—and the editors scarcely help by insistence on 'Platonism' without clearly discriminating between the various usages of that elastic term. For one thing, it throws the emphasis on speculation, which was not Spenser's strong point, and obscures his (already obscure) feeling after a philosophic idea of his own. A little less Plato and a little more

Havelock Ellis would assist the understanding and do greater justice to Spenser.

Beyond these general comments, only details call for remark, and most of the possible remarks seem scarcely worth while. It is surely a waste of space to print nearly a page of quoted comment on VII. xlv, merely to destroy it in three crisp (and highly justified) lines by an editor. It is otiose to cite a Munster place-name as evidence that apples may have been grown there in Spenser's time, to account for a vague reference to apple-culture by a man who had lived in Kent and Cambridge. Reference might be made at I. xiv. 6 to *The Shepheardes Calender*, October, 114 and E.K.'s note; and at II. xxxiv. 6-9, to the *Calender* epilogue. At I. xiii. 6-9, two alternative explanations are given; it might be surmized that the 'lines of light' are heat-lightning. I may be pardoned a local reference: Dr Osgood states (at XI. xxxvi. 1-5) that 'the Tyne in the old authors is called the South Tyne throughout its course', but both Holinshed and Camden rightly describe South Tyne and North Tyne. The Tyne *simpliciter* only exists from Hexham to the sea. But these are trifles.

An interesting list of textual variants in 1596 may be added to: at IV. xi. 5, the Armstrong College copy and B.M. G. 11535 read *wise* for *wize*; my own copy reads, at VIII. i. 8, *wipt*; at VIII. iii. 2, *chanst*. My copy has the following corrected readings in Canto IV: at viii. 2, *Ferrau*; xxi. 5, *Palimord*; xxii. 6, comma after *Maidenhead*; xxiii. 7, comma after *lode*. The minute changes of spelling, the third revision proved by the second set alone, and the frequency of corrections in Canto IV, will call for remark when the question is treated completely in a later volume. Among the readings adopted by the editors one might cavil at a comma or so; but the standard of the edition is maintained—which is all one need say in praise of the text. There is a curious crop of misprints on pages 231-2.

W. L. RENWICK.

STOCKSFIELD, NORTHUMBERLAND.

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. Herausgegeben... von WOLFGANG KELLER und HANS HECHT. Band 71. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1935. 237 pp. 10 M.

One must rejoice that, in spite of the difficulties besetting all works of pure scholarship in Germany at the present time, the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* still flies its flag under the command of Professor Keller and Professor Hecht. Both are past pupils of Professor Brandl, who has lately completed his eightieth year, and it is appropriate that the present *Jahrbuch* should open with an excellent portrait of a man to whom German Shakespeare study owes so much. English scholars will join in the tribute paid him by his fellow-countrymen.

Professor Keller once more provides a series of weighty reviews of recent Shakespearian Literature and Dr Erica Anders's account of contemporary performances on the German stage is of much interest as showing the direction in which the wind is blowing. This part contains in addition four articles, Professor Schirmer's lecture delivered to the Society

on 'Shakespeare and Rhetoric' distinguishes between that School Rhetoric still so strong in Shakespeare's age (as the success of Euphuism testifies), and that natural rhetoric which is the expression of strong emotion. Shakespeare makes the School Rhetoric his own and uses it on many occasions. But Anthony's speech or Henry's before Agincourt is rhetoric of the antique kind such as Cicero used against Catiline, a rhetoric for which no room was found in Elizabethan public life. Dr Paul Steck deals at considerable length with Schiller's obligations to Shakespeare, whom he follows in a realism which he could not have got from the Greeks or the French. In his dramatic style, especially in his heaping up of images, he shows clearly that, in spite of his ignorance of our language, he had sat at Shakespeare's feet. Professor J. W. Draper writing on 'Lord Chamberlain Polonius' maintains that Polonius was a more admirable character than we think who remember Hamlet's gibes at him. His article will provoke contradiction, but that is a point in its favour. Professor Max Wolff has an excellent article on 'Shakespeare and his public', in which he shows that the faults in psychology sometimes attributed to the dramatist (as in Richard III, Prince Hal and the bastard Edmund) are due to the necessity he was under of making the course of his plot and the characters of his dramatis personae transparently clear to an unlettered audience on whom very fine shades would be lost.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age. By C. J. Sisson. Cambridge: University Press. 1936. xii+222 pp. 12s. 6d.

Professor Sisson's untiring researches have borne abundant fruit in this fascinating volume which throws much new light on the dramatic history of Shakespeare's age and incidentally on the behaviour of a number of his contemporaries. It was natural at that time that a private scandal should find expression in literature, and here we can trace the whole process by which unedifying stories first provided materials for the stage and then became the object of proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts and the Court of Star Chamber, in whose records they still live for the amusement of a remote posterity. From the point of view of literary history the fact that one newly unearthed scandal is found to have given birth to a lost play by Chapman and another to a play in which Dekker, Webster, Rowley and Ford all had a hand is of supreme interest, but Professor Sisson with his keen sense of humour presents the scandals as typical of the background of the Elizabethan and Jacobean epoch. Who could imagine a story as complicated in its unfolding as that of *The Old Joiner of Aldgate*, the barber with an heiress daughter whom he sets out to marry to the suitor likely to be most profitable to himself and is robbed of his reward when the girl disregards her enforced promises and marries the minister? Or what play could be more strangely put together than one based on the story of a boy who murdered his mother combined with one of a disreputable widow who had to be kept awake by drink till another

young scoundrel inveigled her into an unseemly marriage with himself? Both plays unfortunately are lost, but so much of their contents is shown in the legal proceedings that Professor Sisson feels he is able to attempt a reconstruction of each.

The long-drawn-out proceedings tell us much about the different courts and we are grieved to find that those called Ecclesiastical were by no means morally superior to the Star Chamber. We learn much on the significance of betrothal, much on the government of the theatre called *The Children of Paul's*. And with some astonishment we find so lofty a writer as George Chapman stooping to produce a piece of mere dramatic journalism.

But this book is occupied with much more than the two plays, *The Old Joiner of Aldgate* and *Keep the Widow Waking*. It especially throws light on that longstanding problem, the nature of the jig and the causes of the obloquy it encountered. The jig found at the end of *Twelfth Night* is merely a dance combined with a song and is perfectly harmless. But when the song became one for two or more singers, its character changed; it tended to suggest a story not very creditable to *somebody*, it became the cause of people gathering to hear the scandal, and the aggrieved party could appeal to the Law. Two such cases have been noted by Professor Sisson.

In one of them Michael Steel, a Yorkshire gentleman, charged a distant neighbour, Edward Meynell, with circulating a libellous version of his behaviour with his maidservant and giving it to stage-players, who at the end of their plays had sung it as a jig. The case eventually came before the Star Chamber when Meynell's servant Mitchell acknowledges that he had written the jig after hearing the story and had communicated it to Steel. The latter appended it to his complaint and so it has come down to us. Professor Sisson gives it the name *Michael and Frances*. In six songs sung to different airs, well-known at the time (e.g. 'Phillida flouts me'), the four characters who take part develop a farcical story which ends with the wife's plea for forgiveness for her false accusation (!). In this, as in Professor Sisson's other example, 'Fortune's Fool', the dance-element is not very obvious, but both are clearly jigs.

Our author goes on to deal with disorders arising from May games held at Wells in 1607, riots at Stratford in 1619 and a faction-war at Nottingham two years earlier. It is clear that local quarrels fired the participants, not to write letters to the newspapers, but to indulge in more ambitious literary ventures. The consequence too often was an infringement of the law of libel, the preservation of the incriminating documents in the Record Office and happily their discovery centuries later by Professor Sisson. I congratulate him on the important use he has made of them.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

The Works of John Milton. Vol. XI. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. xiii + 538 pp. £24 the 18 volumes. Not sold separately.

This eleventh volume of the Columbia Milton contains the *Artis Logicae*, Milton's digest of the logical system of Peter Ramus that had been welcomed in many Protestant quarters as an antidote to the traditional logic of Aristotle. It was presumably compiled in his school-mastering days and is not among his more exciting productions; yet it has value in illustrating his own mental discipline and habits. To take one small instance, the chapter on 'Notation' (an argument depending on words of the same derivation) draws our attention to the fact that Milton's partiality for puns, besides its obvious connexion with the poet's fondness for words and their histories, often has a logical motive. It has been admirably edited by Mr Allan H. Gilbert, with an English translation opposite the Latin. The text is that of the first edition of 1672, and readings are given in the notes from Toland's first complete edition of the prose in 1698, Symmons's edition of 1806 and Pickering's edition of 1851; readings are also given from Milton's sources, the *Dialectica* of Ramus and the *Commentarii* on it by George Downham. The editing was evidently a toilsome business. Mr Gilbert states that errors in the text of 1672 are numerous, most of them probably due to the printer; those which occur in quotations could be corrected with certainty, others by the aid of passages Milton apparently had in mind when writing. For his translation, the first in English, Mr Gilbert has resorted to sixteenth and seventeenth-century translators of Ramus for equivalents of obsolete terms in the Ramistic logic, and has drawn on the same source and on other contemporary writers for many of his renderings of the classical quotations. This prudent method has perhaps been carried too far: '(Logica) res ipsas artibus quasque suis relinquit; arguendi duntaxat inter se quam habeant affectionem sive rationem considerat.' 'Considers merely what affect or ratio for arguing they have among themselves.' Certainly there is no excuse for this sort of English when logical terms are not involved: 'Sic non habitatio, sed ad habitandum aptitudo . . . ' 'Thus not habitation but aptitude for habitating. . . .'

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

The Great Tom Fuller. By DEAN B. LYMAN. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press; Cambridge: University Press. 1935. xii + 198 pp. 10s.

Fuller has shared in the revival of dead fames which is the special mark of our period. 'His works are now scarcely perused but by antiquaries', said the most cunning of revivers, Charles Lamb. Now we are all antiquaries and have an almost morbid appetite for the humoursome and quaint. The times are propitious for such a study of the great man as Mr Lyman has written. Unfortunately he has limited his excellent work to a consideration of Fuller's life. The works come in as incidents in the life. Occasionally the witty savour of his writing is to be tasted in a

brief quotation, and there is the comfort of an excellent bibliography, but with appetites whetted with even no more than Lamb's 'Specimens from the writings of Fuller, the Church historian', we call for a more ample helping from Fuller's noble dish. However, that is Mr Lyman's business. Perhaps after all he was wise to accept the limitations of this study and so avoid the fate of Bailey's standard *Life*, which is so clogged with material of all sorts that at this day it is simply unreadable.

Mr Lyman's book at any rate is eminently readable. He has placed Fuller's life against the background of his stirring age with a nice sense of proportion which will propitiate the historical student. Indeed the historian has cause to thank him for his labours as much as the literary expert. To follow the fortunes of the seventeenth-century divine from the Convocation of 1640 to the time when the dispossessed royalist clergy entered into their kingdom at the Restoration, is to read the history of the Anglican Church at its most eventful period. This Mr Lyman's book does for us, and no one can rise from it without a deepened understanding of the matters which divided good men in that heroic age. Particularly we can see how hard it was for men of Fuller's stamp, that is the moderates, to steer their way in times of national heat, and how inevitable was it that some scandal should attach to those who, like Fuller, managed to make the best of both worlds. Clarendon is admirable in his restrained judgements of many a dubious case of the sort. He understood the moderates better than many of those of the King's party.

This indeed is one of Mr Lyman's tasks, to clear the memory of the great Tom from the scandal of time-serving. He does it rather too faithfully. He does, indeed, succeed in disproving the libel of Lilly, the quack astrologer, that Fuller took the Solemn League and Covenant twice in his Church of the Savoy in the crucial year 1643 and then fled to Oxford. Some sort of covenant he did take, but with such reservations as proved unacceptable to Parliament. In short his conduct as a prominent divine in London at that moment was bold, and it certainly ended in flight to the king's party at Oxford, and thence to the hardships of an army chaplain's life in the west country, which he bore with the sturdy cheerfulness which was part of his nature.

All that is admirable. It is the Commonwealth episode, when he, among others, crept back to London after Naseby and made his peace with the victors, that wants some explaining. Not among reasonable men of course, but among 'Tantavies and High Fliers'. Most damning, his patron was Sir John Danvers, the regicide, and he actually paid a handsome tribute to Sir John in the dedication of his 'Pisgah-Sight of Palestine' (1650). 'How many in Tom Fuller's place, publishing a book within a year and a half of the King's death, would have hastily expunged from its pages any record of obligation to a regicide?' asks Mr Lyman. There is another explanation which Fuller's enemies accepted, and can we in this instance blame them? Mr Lyman's explanation of Fuller's trimming is that his kind of episcopacy was pretty near to the Presbyterian position, pretty near to Baxter's position, for example. This is

fully supported by the records and by his sermons, and, besides, a good man may do many things in unquiet times for the sake of peace in Sion.

Apart from these dead controversies, Fuller himself, Lamb's Fuller, stands out in Mr Lyman's pages. Here the admirable 'elogist' who wrote the first biography of Fuller provides most of the side-lights of the portrait, but a trait or an attitude is taken also from Pepys and the abusive South, and his own prefaces. It is a picture of the entirely humane and cheerful man, fonder of his quips than some straight-laced ones would approve and wholly bent on making men live comfortably one with another. How he entreats that stiff Laudian Dr Peter Heylin to a reconciliation—'Death hath crept into both our clay cottages through the windows, your eyes being bad, mine not good; God mend them both, and sanctify unto us these monitors of mortality; and however it fareth with our corporeal sight, send our souls that collyrium, and heavenly eye-salve, mentioned in Scripture...!' He has the perfect command of that unctuous and overflowing language which in happy moments only a Lamb or a Lang can parody.

Mr Lyman's modest but sufficient notes and his bibliography are excellent. Really I do not know how in the compass of such a short book more could have been accomplished either in the text or the apparatus criticus. The style, apart from a few Americanisms which do little harm, is pleasing, and he has a knack of quoting the right passages.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

William Mountfort. By ALBERT S. BORGMAN. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. ix+221 pp. 10s. 6d.

Dr Albert Borgman, who is already known to students of Restoration literature as the author of a useful monograph on Shadwell, has now published a study of William Mountfort the actor, as the fifteenth volume of the Harvard Studies in English. Dr Borgman tells us that this book is to be regarded as 'an extended footnote' to Colley Cibber's brilliant description of Mountfort in his *Apology*. He rightly describes his work as that of 'an antiquarian of the theatre', and it is certainly a very wide interpretation of the meaning of 'English Studies' which allows it to be included in a series that is presumably intended to consist of critical and historical monographs on English literature.

The book is divided into two parts. The first consisting of 120 pages deals with Mountfort's life and the second of 87 pages with his murder by Captain Hill. If Dr Borgman's work is an 'extended footnote' to Cibber, it may be suggested that the footnote is rather too long. Condensation would have improved the biographical part considerably. Thus it is excusable in such a work to give summaries of Mountfort's own plays and adaptations, but it is hardly necessary to tell the stories of well-known plays by Dryden and Shadwell in which he took parts. Dr Borgman's own style is not distinguished, and it must be admitted that,

even for those interested in the late seventeenth century, his life of Mountfort is rather tedious reading.

The second part of the book retells the well-known story of Captain Richard Hill's infatuation with Mrs Bracegirdle, his jealousy of Mountfort and the fatal sequel. The story has already been told in detail by another American scholar, Mr Robert Forsythe, in his book on Lord Mohun called *A Noble Rake* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928). Forsythe based his account of the murder on the report of Lord Mohun's trial published by order of the House of Lords in 1693. In addition to this contemporary printed account Dr Borgman has made use of an important manuscript source of information, which has hitherto been overlooked in this connexion. He also describes and quotes the two elegies on Mountfort's death and the anonymous prose story called *The Player's Tragedy* published in 1693, from which he quotes passages that show that it is worthy of the attention of students of the early novel.

The manuscript used by Dr Borgman is to be found on ff. 46-50 of Egerton 2623 (British Museum) which contain a series of depositions concerning the murder by thirteen witnesses. These depositions are printed in full by Dr Borgman in an appendix, and he also gives a photograph of a page of the Egerton MS. They do not add anything material to our knowledge of the murder, though they provide some interesting details, such as the allegation of Mrs Bracegirdle's servant that Mountfort provoked Hill by speaking in an insulting way about him to Lord Mohun. They establish Lord Mohun's innocence beyond a shadow of doubt, and thus substantiate the arguments of Forsythe in *A Noble Rake*. In two other appendices Dr Borgman gives accounts of Mountfort's farce based on Marlowe's *Dr Faustus*, and of the theatrical history of his original plays. He shows that Mountfort's text of his farce of *Faustus*, though it seems to follow generally the edition of 1663, is in some places much closer to that of 1631. He thinks it unlikely that Mountfort had both texts before him, and makes the plausible suggestion that either Edward Wright or Gilbertson, the printers to whom the play was assigned between 1646 and 1663, may have brought out between those dates an edition of which no copy has survived.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Letters of Lawrence Sterne. Edited by LEWIS PERRY CURTIS. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1935. xxxiv + 495 pp. 30s.

This handsome one-volume edition of Sterne's letters is the latest evidence of the vogue of these letters which has hardly fallen off since Lydia Sterne gave the world the first collection in 1775. In our own generation we have had the vintage year 1927 when Brimley Johnson published his selection of ninety-one letters, and the Oxford edition of Sterne's works devoted its first volume to giving 184 letters, mostly genuine. Before that there was Lewis Melville's edition of 1910 with its 152 letters and the American edition of the Works by Governor Cross,

1904, with 176 letters. Saintsbury's edition of the Works in 1894 devoted the better part of two volumes to 125 letters.

The present edition of the letters is likely to mark the final appeasement of this slightly morbid taste. For one thing there does not seem to be much chance of new letters turning up. 'Even after a wide inquiry upon the Continent, where he passed several years, I have recovered no more than a fragment of one unpublished letter.' And for another, Mr Curtis has not only scoured the platter but has subjected letters in the least way dubious to such a scientific scrutiny that nothing would seem to be left to a later editor to do. Cavil and debate about individual letters will remain of course, but the material for such argumentation is all here. The forty-seven letters published by anonymous editors, for example, between 1775 and 1804 have all gone through Mr Curtis's assaying glass and are all excluded for one reason or another. Learned curiosity has since the publication of the *Letters* been satisfied by an article by Mr Curtis in the *P.M.L.A.* for December 1935 which argues the authorship of the forty-seven letters in question. By copious citation of parallel passages these are declared to be forgeries by Sterne's imitator Wm. Combe. The biographers of Sterne have so far been misled.

These editorial labours, not to speak of the comfort of the single volume, would alone have justified this new edition. But what will strike the casual reader as the outstanding feature of the edition is the deep padding of notes which are somehow rendered tolerable to the eye, and therefore the mind, by the art of the printer. Apparently it is the manner of such editions to-day to risk a great deal in the way of notes, and personally I am of those who feed most satisfyingly on such matter. The Toynbee and Whibley edition of Gray's letters for example stretches its leathern coat almost to bursting with such small stuff. The truth is the reader of eighteenth-century letters is a serious person who welcomes every small detail which helps to fill out the background. Mr Curtis was indeed in some doubt of his own practice here (he need not have been so far as I am concerned), for he appeals in his Introduction to Boswell's apologia: 'I cannot allow any fragment whatever that floats in my memory concerning the great subject of this work to be lost.' Background, always background, is the demand of the understanding reader to-day, and there is no more economical way of providing background for those who can read than voluminous pertinent notes.

Mr Curtis indeed had a further excuse for rather overdoing the notes business, and that is that Sterne himself was apparently not much interested in his own particular local background, which was for the most part York and its surrounding villages. 'Almost all his assumptions and prejudices were derived from Yorkshire.' For the more spacious world of fashion in which he was really interested there is 'an opulence of provocative allusions' in which the reader gropes about uneasily. This uneasiness Mr Curtis has for the most part dissipated and for this we must be grateful.

The Introduction to the letters is a discriminating apologia for Sterne. 'They do much to rehabilitate him.' The editor knows all that is to be

said against him, all the falsity and apparent heartlessness which are barely disguised by what often looks like a canting appeal to the heart and a constant display of strained wit. Here temperament and charity must be one's guide, for Sterne provides one of the most puzzling problems of character. For the prosecution it must be conceded that it is not a matter of the unco' guid sitting in judgement. It is the rank bad taste of many of the letters which offends. For the defence, and here Mr Curtis is ready, Sterne's cant is to be in great part referred to the cant of the day, the cant of 'nature', and the reaction against a stuffy puritanism which took the form of belauding the 'good-natured' man with all his moral lapses. But I need not labour this matter. On the larger consideration, many readers while conceding that the letters are 'characteristic and revealing' will deny that they can possibly vie with Gray's letters for general interest or Walpole's for wit. A man, even a man of genius, who is shut up like Sterne in his own Shandean bandbox of a world cannot write like men free of the world. Cowper could make his little domestic world supremely interesting, but then he had no Shandean pose to distort everything.

Of the ten new letters which Mr Curtis has rescued hardly one seems to be particularly worth the pain of getting. The letter to Lord Effingham however (29 May 1765), dug out of an old magazine, is treasure trove, exhibiting Sterne, as it does, in his most extravagant humour. But the search for new letters was not the chief preoccupation of the editor, whose labours would have justified themselves if he had found nothing new. The volume is a monument of patient and scrupulous scholarship and takes its place with the Buxton-Forman one-volume Keats and the Toynbee-Whibley Gray in three—though that looks like extravagant praise!

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

Correspondence of Thomas Gray. Edited by the late PAGET TOYNBEE and LEONARD WHIBLEY. In three volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. cxxx + 1360 pp. 63s.

It is safe to say that this great work will be the standard edition of Gray's letters for many years to come. Its points of superiority are these:

1. It is more complete than any previous edition. The publishers claim on the dust-cover that the edition contains 130 more letters than were printed by Tovey. Most of these have already been published, notably in *The Correspondence of Gray, Walpole, West, and Ashton*, but the newly discovered letters are by no means trifles unconsidered by earlier editors. Amongst them there is an undated letter to Walpole (119), so cool in tone that the editors think it cannot have been written long after the reconciliation; there is one to Brown (403), describing the siege of the Duke of Bedford's house in Bloomsbury by an angry mob of silk weavers, and one to Mary Antrobus (305), written during the worries of furnishing rooms in Southampton Row. There are two letters from Beattie (469, 507*), criticising the *Odes*, and more interesting still, four

letters to Bedingfield (215, 222, 231, 244), in which Gray comments on his own poetry and transcribes portions of *The Bard*, on which he was then at work, for Bedingfield's criticism. This is the pick of the new bunch, but by no means the whole of it.

2. The presentation of the letters is more satisfactory than in any former edition. Mr Whibley claims that more than three-fourths of the letters have been printed from the originals, and the source of the text is always clearly stated. I have checked the transcript of some of the Wharton letters and found a very high degree of accuracy. Special attention has been paid to the dating of the letters, two examples of which may be cited. Gray writes to Chute (147*) of his hope of obtaining the Regius Professorship of History on Shallet Turner's death. The letter, which is undated, had previously been assigned to November 1762; but from a closer study of the internal evidence the present editors are able to establish that it must have been written between 1747 and 1751, thus antedating by at least eight years the earliest reference to Gray's pretensions to the Chair. Letter 156 is addressed to Wharton and contains a draft of the *Elegy*, the draft, in fact, which is exhibited at the British Museum. Hitherto the letter has been dated 1751, but the editors show, once more from internal evidence, that the correct date is 1750. The mechanical part of the presentation of the text—the format, typography, and paper—is as good as we have learned to expect from the Clarendon Press. Indeed one would have nothing but praise for this part of the work if it had not been decided to make cross-references in terms of letters instead of in terms of pages. The reader's habits are soon changed, but it is difficult to see what has been gained by the change, and much is lost in point of time and convenience. For example, a reference to Buffon's *Histoire Naturelle* in Index III directs the reader to Letter 423, and on turning it up, he finds four pages to search through instead of one. Nor is it possible to find such a reference as 'Letter 423, n. 19' with the same rapidity as 'p. 932, n. 19'. However, the reader's irritation is a little soothed by the commendable innovation of printing the dates of the letters at the top of each page, a great convenience in consultation.

3. This is the most fully annotated edition. Readers who enjoyed the expansiveness of Tovey may complain that the present editors' style in annotation is too desiccated. But desiccation implies condensation, and condensation allows more space for explaining many things left unexplained by Mitford and Tovey. The editors' work has been very thorough, and where so much has been successfully annotated it seems ungracious to enumerate blemishes. But their scarcity and insignificance is some measure of the editors' success. *Tidewater* (p. 759) needs a note; and it is surprising that the editors, who elsewhere show themselves so well-read in Pope, should have missed the reference to the *Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot*, l. 226 at p. 343, l. 5. There is an odd oversight on p. 1150, where Lord Burlington, who died in 1834, is said to have been the last survivor of those who had known Gray, yet on the previous page the editors quote an account which Lord St Helens (d. 1839) gave to Samuel Rogers of an interview he had with Gray in 1770.

A contribution of two items to the Errata: p. 260, n. 5, for 1602-5 read 1602-85; the other, from the index, p. 1352, 'Warton, Thomas', for 501 read 509.

JOHN BUTT.

LONDON.

Jewish Characters in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction and Drama. By H. R. S. VAN DER VEEN. Groningen, Batavia: J. B. Wolters. 1935. 308 pp. f. 4.90.

The appearance of this ample volume suggests an inclination on the part of Dutch scholars to complete the story of the Jew in English literature which Michelson's *The Jew in Early English Literature* (Amsterdam, 1926) and Cardozo's *The Contemporary Jew in Elizabethan Drama* (Amsterdam, 1925) so ably began. The story is not a happy one. Although the eighteenth century witnessed the first parliamentary efforts to grant some measure of emancipation to the Jews, Dr Van der Veen finds little that is not deplorable in their delineation in prose fiction and drama. His censure is certainly justified, even though at times his over-sensitiveness leads him to suspect virulent animosity where there is only the thoughtless derision which was impartially accorded to Jews, Scots, Quakers and all other deviations, whether domestic or foreign, from the norm established by popular prejudice.

Dr Van der Veen analyses in great detail the few Jewish characters introduced by novelists from Defoe to Fanny Burney, and finds Smollett's benevolent Joshua Manasseh in *Count Fathom* (1753) a distinguished exception to the general rule of abuse. This favourable picture he attributes to the pro-Jewish sentiment aroused in that year by the passing of the Naturalization Bill, an ill-fated measure that had to be repealed in the following year owing to reactionary clamour. The stage Jew affords him more material for discussion. Chronologically the plays involving Jews are unevenly spaced. Dr Van der Veen finds only five in the first half of the century (had he known Thomas Baker's *An Act at Oxford*, 1704, and its adaptation, *Hampstead Heath*, 1706, where a 'Beau Jew' is impersonated, he could have usefully increased this small group); but in the latter half no less than twenty-three appeared, including several unpublished pieces now preserved in the Huntington Library. The explanation suggested is that the Naturalization Bill focused attention on the Jewish community.

As the century drew to a close the growth of humanitarianism led to occasional idealized pictures, and Cumberland's sympathetic study of Sheva in *The Jew* (1794) is particularly emphasized. But nowhere does the Jew figure in pure tragedy, nowhere is there 'an attempt, however feeble, to depict the Jewish psyche, or to portray some aspects of Jewish life'. By the hostile majority the Jew is shown as stupid, avaricious, cowardly, villainous, foppish, boastful, gullible, amorous, and licentious; by the sympathetic minority, as incredibly noble and philanthropic. On the rare occasions when Jewesses are introduced they are unpleasant

figures with a Jessica-like tendency to deceive their fathers and elope with non-Jewish lovers.

In an appendix Dr Van der Veen prints for the first time, from the manuscript in the Huntington Library, *The Israelites; or, The Pampered Nabob* (1785), a two-act farce formerly associated with Smollett's name. Its interest is held to lie in its presentation, 'for the first time...in drama', of the Jew as an ordinary human being with both good and bad qualities.

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth. Arranged and edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. xviii + 578 pp. 25s.

All students of Wordsworth will welcome this volume very gratefully and will use it for many years to come. It is long overdue, and it was very badly needed. Hitherto, Knight's *Letters of the Wordsworth Family* has had to suffice for those who were unable to consult the manuscripts. Yet this edition of the Letters, useful as it was, and, until now, indispensable, omitted so much that it failed to fulfil the primary function of such a collection of letters—the giving of as full and uninterrupted an impression as possible of the day-to-day life in which such poetry as Wordsworth's and such prose as Dorothy's had their genesis.

The Early Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth, in which the letters, when the manuscript has been preserved, are reproduced, almost without exception, in their entirety, does all that can now be done towards giving a full and uninterrupted impression of this day-to-day life. Yet it would be unjust to the intense creative life of Wordsworth to forget that the sources of this creative life are not entirely revealed through these letters. It would be difficult to realize from this volume that the 'friends' and 'great allies' of Wordsworth's muse during this period were, literally, 'exultations, agonies'. That the Wordsworthian world entire is not here, in its heights and depths, that but a faint idea is given, either of the formidable element of sheer suffering or of the element of 'giddy bliss' in Wordsworth's poetic strivings, can be realized at once when we compare the final impression made by reading the book with the impression made by *The Prelude* or by the *Journals* of Dorothy Wordsworth, and such a comparison brings at once a realization of the element that is lacking. The strongest force in the lives of both Wordsworth and Dorothy at this period was Coleridge. To him it was that they revealed the stress and strain of the inner life in which their creative powers were generated. Yet in this volume, containing two hundred and forty letters, only six of these are addressed to Coleridge. That so small a proportion of the many letters to Coleridge has been preserved means that we get in a collection of Wordsworthian letters much secondary material, all of it valuable, but not to be confused with the primary material, which, if it had been possible to add it to what is given, would have built up an impression of the Wordsworthian world entire.

Even so, even when it is recognized that the letters which should have been the heart of such a collection are missing, the reading of this volume is an experience. The publication of these letters, in their entirety, is an event in Wordsworthian scholarship and will probably inaugurate a new era of Wordsworthian criticism. It will certainly prove a prelude to much re-evaluation of previous knowledge and testing of the foundations of Wordsworthian scholarship. One question which is raised by the concluding letters of 1805 is of great importance—the date of the manuscript of *The Prelude* in Sara Hutchinson's handwriting. From these letters we learn that at the close of 1805 Mary Wordsworth was copying *The Prelude* 'as a gift to be presented to Coleridge on his return' and that Dorothy was engaged in making 'a fair and final transcript' of the poem. This work was continued in the beginning of 1806. In a letter of 2 March 1806,¹ Dorothy refers again to these two copies of *The Prelude* and also to two copies of her journal of her tour in Scotland, one of which was being made by herself, and the other of which was being made by Sara Hutchinson for Coleridge. There is no mention at all in the letters of this time of a copy of *The Prelude* made by Sara Hutchinson. When, then, was Sara's copy made? Professor de Selincourt suggests, on p. xvi of his Introduction to his edition of *The Prelude* (1926), that this copy was made at the same time as the copy of which Dorothy thought as the 'fair and final transcript' of the poem. But Sara's copy differs so much from Dorothy's that it would be the strangest thing in the world if these two copies had been made at the same time. The differences are not confined to mere alterations in phrasing. Many passages are much revised and expanded, and in Book vi there are notable additions in Sara's manuscript. The evidence seems to indicate that some of these had their inception at Coleorton, in conversations with Coleridge after the poem had been read to him, and the manuscript of Book vi is followed by some of his notes.

It would seem that in Sara Hutchinson's copy of *The Prelude* we have, not a copy made at the same time as Dorothy's, but a manuscript of a later date, made some time after Coleridge's return to England in 1806, incorporating Wordsworth's revisions and additions after he had had the benefit of Coleridge's comments, and coming midway between Dorothy's copy and John Carter's.

With the note on Letter 59 we come to debatable matter. According to Professor de Selincourt this letter proves that Mary Hutchinson had left Racedown before Coleridge's visit. This letter is a note to Richard Wordsworth, written by Wordsworth with the intention of sending it by post, on the morning of Sunday, 4 June² 1797, the day before Coleridge's arrival at Racedown. It is followed by a note from Dorothy, evidently written on the following day, saying that instead of sending the letter by post, as they had originally intended, they were going to send it by Mary Hutchinson, who, 'contrary to her intention yesterday', now meant to travel by London. Dorothy does not mention the day on which Mary

¹ British Museum Add. MSS. 36,997.

² 5 June is the date given by Professor de Selincourt, but Sunday was the 4th.

is to travel, but in her previous letter to Richard, of 28 May, she had written: 'Mary Hutchinson is still with us, but I am afraid we shall lose her in the course of the next fortnight', and Wordsworth's letter of 12 June shows that by that time Mary had left. It seems to me that far from proving that Mary Hutchinson was not at Racedown at the time of Coleridge's arrival, Letter 59 but proves that at the time of Coleridge's arrival Mary Hutchinson was making her preparations for departure.

On the assumption that this letter proves that Mary Hutchinson had left Racedown before Coleridge's arrival, Professor de Selincourt suggests that Letter 61, written by Dorothy, as Bishop Wordsworth explained, in the *Memoirs*, 'to a friend who had left Racedown early in 1797', was written to Mary Hutchinson, and suggests also that Letter 63 was written to Mary. It seems to me that the chain of evidence with regard to these letters, slender as it is owing to the gap in Wordsworthian letters from April or May 1796 to 19 March 1797, indicates rather as the recipient of them another of Dorothy's intimate friends, Elizabeth Threlkeld the younger—daughter of Mr William Threlkeld of Halifax—who had probably been visiting Dorothy early in the year and had left sometime in March.

There are one or two minor inexactitudes of detail in connexion with the Cooksons of Forncett and Dorothy's Halifax friends. Little is known even now of the group of friends at Halifax among whom Dorothy spent her youth, but it is certain that Elizabeth Threlkeld married, not Samuel Rawson, as Professor de Selincourt states on p. 41 of *The Early Letters*, but William Rawson of Mill House, Halifax. On p. 41 Professor de Selincourt has the note: 'In the following December or January "Aunt" Threlkeld married Samuel Rawson....'

Elizabeth Threlkeld married William Rawson on 7 March 1791.¹

For the most part, the many errors of Knight's edition have been corrected. There is, however, one letter—Number 180 of *The Early Letters*—in which Knight's misdating has been retained. The exact dating of this letter is of great importance, as the general acceptance of Knight's original error has caused much confusion as to the relationship between *The Prelude* and *The Recluse*.²

Some of the early letters of Dorothy Wordsworth, which are to be found in manuscript in the British Museum, have not been included in this edition. Despite this omission, the comprehensiveness of this collection of letters will make it, for many years to come, the primary source of information as to the lives of the Wordsworths between 1787 and 1805.

¹ Some pleasant evidences of Wordsworth's relations with Mr and Mrs William Rawson are still to be gleaned at Halifax. The library of the Literary and Philosophical Society contains a copy of Wordsworth's pamphlet on the Convention of Cintra 'Presented by the author to W.R.' and presented by William Rawson to the Halifax Circulating Library on 20 May 1810, while the Diary of Miss Lister, one of Mrs William Rawson's acquaintances, contains a record of her conversation having a very interesting bearing on one of the most picturesque passages of *The Excursion*.

² My reasons for believing this letter to be incorrectly dated are given in full in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 3 October 1935.

Half the toil of the future biographer has already been accomplished for him.

CATHERINE M. MACLEAN.

CARDIFF.

The Voice of England; a History of English Literature. By CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD. New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1935. xv+627 pp. 12s. 6d.

This book by the Princeton professor, who is perhaps best known for his labours over Spenser, but whose conversance with our literature reaches from the beginnings to the present hour, is of a kind too rarely seen. It is neither a textbook (it would defy the crammer's craft) nor yet a full-dress, formal history in 'scientific' panoply. It is addressed, doubtless, first of all to younger students who need to be tempted into the garden, or to the unprofessional reader. The reading and scholarship, though evident to the seniors, are well concealed, often lurking in a word (as in the remarks, p. 91, on the three drafts of *Piers Plowman*). The style is easy, familiar, sometimes markedly conversational, and vivid, with sudden informal overtures ('Burton escaped the rancors of the time by staying quietly at Oxford where he belonged', p. 259). There are judicious pages on the social and historical background of English letters (as on Cavalier and Puritan, pp. 215-16). Professor Osgood, though very much alive to qualities of form and rhythm (as in his comments, p. 247, upon Milton's music, and on Old English verse, p. 17), is on the whole more concerned with the vital substance of literature and with the life and character of the artist. I have marked far more passages than can be quoted here, which attest his critical sense:

(On Browning, p. 499) 'no poet, not even Homer, was ever more nearly omnivorous in his poetic appetite'. (Of *Faerie Queene*, books iii and iv, p. 169) 'The two books are a kind of symphonic elaboration on the theme of romantic love with friendship, as the most exalting influence in human life'. (Of Thomas Hardy, p. 557) 'His stories are full of accidents and coincidence, sometimes far-fetched; but he sees to it that almost without exception these accidents are unlucky'.

The story down to the death of Chaucer fills 120 pages, of which forty-five are given to Old English. These last in some respects are the freshest in the book; and anyone who has attempted a similar task will know the difficulties of keeping to scale and at the same time of enlisting interest in those who do not read the old language. Mr Osgood's bits of translation will attract such students; though not in the strictest alliterative verse, according to the old rules, they give the general movement very well, and, what is more, they read like poetry. Throughout his book he insists, most justly, on the true test of poetry—reading it *aloud*. The same zest accompanies him through Middle English; and we can be grateful not only for his presentment of the greater figures but for his ample praise of writers so different as Manning of Brunne and Richard Rolle. I think it a mistake in arrangement that the folk-ballad should figure not in the chapter on the fifteenth century, but in the pages devoted

to its revival in the eighteenth; and, although the view (p. 370) that the ballad should be sung, and is primarily lyric or song, is of the soundest, I could wish that more examples had been named.

Mr Osgood's gusto does not fail him when he reaches the greater poets and prose writers; and his account of Spenser, as we should expect, stands out. He manages, too, to find a niche for scores of lesser figures and to say something about them that is not commonplace. Impossible here to accompany him over such an expanse; and no two students will agree everywhere about the right emphasis. Still, a little more on Henryson, on Campion, and above all upon Burke, would have been welcome. Probably many readers will turn first to the chapters on the later Victorians and on the writers of to-day. When I call Mr Osgood an impenitent Victorian I mean it as a compliment. His last chapter, entitled 'With Many Voices', is a careful survey of the writing of 'this tragic generation', with its confusions of standard ('criticism is in a state of anarchy', p. 569); and the picture, in the nature of the case, cannot be made quite distinct. Still, the canon by which Mr Osgood judges is the old canon of performance, or execution; and he closes with a clear and sympathetic note on A. E. Housman, on Mr Yeats, and on the present Laureate. I must not leave any impression that this is just a book for beginners. It does not seem yet to have been duly noticed in England, but it should have its place in any school, or college, or general library. There is an appendix by Mr Willard Thorp of seven pages, suggesting 'some of the better and more authoritative books likely to be of use to readers of English literature'. The list is a good one, though confined to books written in English; but Sir Edmund Chambers's *Shakespeare* should have been included. There is a full index.

OLIVER ELTON.

OXFORD.

The Works of Guillaume De Salluste Sieur Du Bartas. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and Variants. In three volumes. By URBAN TIGNER HOLMES, JR., JOHN CORIDEN LYONS, ROBERT WHITE LINKER, with the assistance of others. Vol. I, *The Life of Du Bartas*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. ix+240 pp. 22s. 6d.

Il est très réconfortant d'apprendre que nous allons bientôt avoir entre les mains une édition critique des œuvres complètes de Du Bartas; ce travail considérable, nécessaire et trop longtemps négligé (n'est-ce pas une honte pour la France que la dernière édition d'un poète qui, malgré ses défauts, lui fait très grand honneur date de 1632?) a été entreprise par trois érudits américains, Professor Holmes, Professor Lyons et M. Linker. Le premier des trois volumes promis, signé de M. Holmes et formant l'introduction générale de l'ouvrage, vient de voir le jour. Il nous fait très favorablement augurer de ce que seront les volumes suivants consacrés au texte même des œuvres de Du Bartas. Il débute naturellement par une étude biographique du poète: ici l'auteur n'apporte rien de très nouveau et n'ajoute rien de bien important à ce qui était

précédemment connu de la vie de Du Bartas; mais il a soigneusement rassemblé, confronté et mis au point des renseignements qui sont disséminés dans un nombre considérable d'ouvrages et d'articles, parfois peu accessibles. Il est probable qu'on n'augmentera plus guère cette somme de connaissances et le travail de M. Holmes a des chances d'être la biographie définitive de notre poète.

Le chapitre suivant est consacré à la réputation de Du Bartas sur le Continent; on se rendra compte à première vue qu'il est très regrettable qu'on ait décidé d'exclure de cette étude le pays où l'influence de Du Bartas a été la plus féconde—l'Angleterre. Ce dernier sujet, il est vrai, a déjà été étudié; malgré tout l'auteur, qui ne s'est pas fait scrupule de résumer copieusement d'autres travaux, aurait pu rappeler les conclusions de l'excellente thèse d'Ashton¹ et celles d'études plus récentes—auxquelles il rend du reste un hommage mérité. Le tableau tracé par M. Holmes est donc volontairement incomplet; cette réserve faite, et à part un certain décousu ici et là, le chapitre est excellent.

L'étude des sources de *La Sepmaine* manque un peu de netteté, du moins à son début: trois sujets s'y rencontrent, d'importance inégale, que l'auteur n'a pas distingués aussi clairement qu'on aurait pu le désirer: les théories de la Pléiade sur le poème épique, la poésie pieuse, la littérature hexaémérale. Le premier de ces points est banal; le second n'a pas grand'chose en commun avec la question: Juvencus, Pétrarque, Marot, Anne des Marquets, Desportes et quelques autres auraient pu être omis. Le reste du chapitre est intéressant et bien vu, quoiqu'il laisse l'impression d'une certaine imprécision; on regrette de ne pas trouver plus de renvois au texte même de Du Bartas, ce qui aurait donné plus de poids aux affirmations de l'auteur et aurait permis un certain contrôle.

Comme il est naturel, on remarque dans ce premier volume quelques omissions: à propos de la philosophie de St Augustin et la philosophie médiévale, on eût aimé à voir cités les ouvrages de M. Ét. Gilson,² à propos du chanoine Loys Papon celui de Mrs Keeler,³ sur Anne de Marquets la thèse de Mrs Seiler.⁴ Omission plus sérieuse, que les volumes suivants, espérons-le, rectifieront, il n'y a pas de bibliographie.

On relève aussi un certain nombre de fautes d'impression, relativement peu nombreuses.⁵ Toutes ces remarques, et quelques autres criti-

¹ Ashton, *Du Bartas en Angleterre* (Paris).

² Ét. Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de St Augustin*, aussi *L'Esprit de la Philosophie médiévale*.

³ Sr. M. J. Keeler, *Étude sur la poésie... de Loys Papon* (1930).

⁴ Sr. M. H. Seiler, *Anna de Marquets, poétesse religieuse du XVI^e siècle* (1931).

⁵ Voici une liste, incomplète probablement, de ces erreurs; éloigné de toute bibliothèque pendant ce mois d'août, il m'a été impossible de vérifier:

p. 37, l. 25. Au lieu de *As*, lire *A*.

p. 38, l. 24. Au lieu de *sans*, lire *dans*.

p. 39, dernière ligne de la note 31; pour marquer la ténacité, de même que ce jeu de mots un peu rabelaisien, imprimer: Versi-hodie-cul.

p. 62, l. 11. Date de *Magnificence*.

p. 69, note 3. Au lieu de *Arsenal* lire *Arsenal*.

p. 108, l. 4. Lire *Plantin*.

p. 135, l. 18. Au lieu de *miliieu*, lire *million* (ou *million*).

p. 146, l. 12. Un vers faux.

ques du même genre, ne portent guère que sur des détails d'importance minime; le travail de longue haleine entrepris par les érudits de l'Université de North Carolina mérite notre profonde reconnaissance et nos sincères compliments. Nous attendrons avec quelque impatience les deux volumes de textes qui nous sont promis.

F. J. TANQUEREY.

LONDON.

Tite. Tragi-comédie de Jean Magnon (1660). Critical edition by HERMAN BELL. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press; Paris: Les Belles-Lettres. 1936. 139 pp. 6s.

'Beautiful in spots', 'lines of high merit in the play', thus Mr Bell sums up the praise accorded by Bidou and Bordeaux, in 1913 and 1920, to Magnon's *Tite*, praise regarded by him, rather surprisingly and unkindly, as 'ecstatic' and undeserved. A determination, perhaps, to resist that undue tenderness so easily bred by research towards the researchee? Magnon's claims to consideration, it is inflexibly asserted, rest upon the fact that his works 'furnish material aid in understanding the better dramatists of the day'. After expressing the hope 'that some pleasure will be derived from reading the last play of a man who had a modest part in the making of one of the finest periods of literature', Mr Bell must have blamed himself for allowing his feelings to run away with him. Only a single copy is known of this play, the text of which is now published equipped with an Introduction giving the main facts of the author's life and 'the assembled evidence to demonstrate the importance of *Tite*'; a list of Magnon's other works, a bibliography and an index. For studies of the other plays, the reader is referred to Professor Carrington Lancaster's book. Misprints are few, it looks though as if we should read *heureuse* for *généreuse* in l. 190; *Je* for *Il* in l. 1022; *suit* for *fuit* in l. 1486; *mon* for *ton* in l. 1755.

Racine owed little if anything to Magnon, but Mr Bell pounces upon every situation, line or phrase suggesting echoes in Corneille's *Tite et Bérénice*. Both playwrights, as the Introduction shows, must have used common sources; Corneille adopted much the same set of historical characters as Magnon, and, like him, elected to give the play an un-historical and happy ending. Both indulged in *lieux communs* of love and politics. Cross-influencing has to be reckoned with: Bordeaux sees reminiscences of earlier Cornelian dramas in *Tite*. Both writers readily plagiarized themselves—Mr Bell's annotations make that clear for Magnon—evidently holding with Malherbe that a man was at liberty to

Appendices. p. 198, l. 29. Au lieu de *Le fur*, lire *Le feu*.

p. 199, l. 26. Au lieu de *d'environne*, lire *s'environne*.

p. 199, l. 31. Au lieu de *Venez-vous, que le Dieu*, lire *Venez, vous que le Dieu*.

p. 203, l. 3. Au lieu de *vre*, lire *vostre*.

p. 203, l. 4. Au lieu de *chassons le temps*, lire *passons*.

Supprimer le tréma et lire *cheute* (p. 199, l. 5); *leu* (p. 191, l. 8); *peu* (p. 189, l. 34; p. 196, l. 6); *sceu* (p. 197, ll. 36 et 37); *veu* (p. 190, l. 5; p. 197, l. 11); *veit* (p. 190, l. 25); *hayt* (p. 190, l. 30).

remove his own knick-knacks from his own table to his own window. And if it may be said without irreverence, the exigencies of rhyme made themselves felt in both (Rome—homme, monde—seconde, etc.). The resulting collection of similarities amounts to an *embarras de richesses*. Direct progeny or scattered collaterals, 'Je suis maître de moi comme de l'univers'; 'Je suis maître du monde et non pas de mon âme'; 'Maître de l'univers sans l'être de moi-même'; to which might be added: '...j'aime mieux être, avec mes propres fers, Seul maître de mon cœur que de tout l'univers' (*Tite*). 'Sans songer à l'empire elle aima l'empereur' may have inspired 'Bérénice aime Tite et non pas l'empereur', but *Cinna* already had 'Sa mort... Fut un crime d'Octave et non de l'empereur'. It cannot be denied that these phrase-reverberations do occur in dramatists who used the rhymed alexandrine. *Héraclius* is heard in *Les Femmes Savantes*, and *Tartufe* in *l'Orphelin de la Chine*. It must be because Mr Bell himself felt that the line had to be drawn somewhere that he refrained from comparing ll. 355-6: 'Et par un sentiment aussi juste que doux, Si vous n'êtes qu'à moi, me donner tout à vous', with *Le Misanthrope*: 'Puisque vous n'êtes point, en des liens si doux, Pour trouver tout en moi, comme moi tout en vous...'. Only one of Corneille's alleged cribbings, however, escapes notice: Tite's slightly bathetic 'je ne contrains personne'. Corneille was not always a judicious borrower. 'Non, seigneur, faites mieux et quittez qui vous quitte' is truly not an improvement on 'Je vous quitte bien plus que vous ne me quittez'.

But divergences are interesting. Magnon's frankly romantic outlook may be preferred to Corneille's colder manner, even though he is occasionally guilty of *galimatias double*, whereas Corneille in this case did not go beyond *galimatias simple*. The rather preposterous disguise of his heroine provided effective situations which are effectively handled, sometimes with unexpected and telling simplicity. His disillusioned, passionate and elusive Bérénice appeals more to the imagination than his famous rival's. Indeed, Corneille (*pace* M. Jean Schlumberger!) here falls between two stools, having neither Magnon's imaginative buoyancy, nor that sober penetrating sadness which drew tears from so hard-boiled an individual as Frederick the Great.

H. BIBAS.

CAMBRIDGE.

The 'genre poissard' and the French Stage of the eighteenth century. By A. P. MOORE. Institute of French Studies, Columbia University. 1935. 422 pp. with two plates.

One welcomes every scrap of fresh information concerning the habits and tastes of the *peuple* under the French monarchy. This alone justifies the publication of Dr Moore's historical sketch of the origins and evolution of the genre *poissard* which is exhaustively illustrated by *précis* of works written in *poissard*. The author tells us at the outset that he is not here concerned with the linguistic aspect of his subject. Nevertheless, most readers would have welcomed some sort of definition of *le langage poissard*. Dr Moore mentions frequently that a certain play, poem or

novel is not written in genuine *poissard*, but he does not disclose his criterion. Perhaps in this difficult matter it might have been well to describe *poissard* for the layman's benefit as the Parisian counterpart of Cockney. As it is, one is left with a certain sense of confusion regarding, for instance, the language of the *parades* written by Gueullette, Collé, etc. Dr Moore implies (p. 71) that *poissard* is exclusively Parisian or suburban, and quotes in full Collé's well-known and amusing *Magnière de Discours* on the origin of the *parade* (ed. H. Bonhomme). But he does not quote from that work Collé's important footnote which contradicts his conjecture. Collé makes it clear that the language of these *parades* 'leux prononciation vicieuse zet pleine de cuirs' was by no means exclusively Parisian but was to be found amongst all actors, provincial and Parisian, 'qui n'ont pas té û zune certaine éducation soigneuse'. And Collé's own parody of the language of the *parades* indicates without a doubt that apart from the 'literary' content of such plays their chief humour lay in 'cuirs', malapropisms or comic mispronunciations of literary words. Now, if we contrast the seventeenth-century examples of *poissard* quoted so generously by Dr Moore on pp. 62-77, it will be noted that there is a remarkable absence of 'cuirs' and that there are practically no mispronunciations of academic words. On this Dr Moore makes no comment and he advances no theory as to the origin of the *poissard* imitated by Collé in his *Discours* and used by him and others in the *parades* which they concocted. One wonders, for example, whether the vogue for 'cuirs', e.g., 'pour être zauteurs', 'zavait', 'za ce que', etc., and for the typical substitution of certain consonants for others, e.g., 'reguingotte', 'ami-quié', 'sièque', did not perhaps originate in the comic imitation of the 'pidgin' French of the Italian players whom the *forains* imitated in other respects. This, I know, is pure conjecture: it would be interesting, however, to hear the views of an expert on the subject.

In a series of chapters, Dr Moore discusses very thoroughly the themes of *poissard* playwrights, poets and novelists. From this useful survey it is clear that the interest of such work is rather linguistic than social or literary. It corroborates, however, the impression of the *peuple* which one has gleaned from other sources—quarrelsome and noisy but not vindictive, sentimentally loyal, class-conscious but not subversive, on the whole *bon enfant* and not so sordid or brutal as the London populace of the period. Dr Moore gives examples of the intimate and affectionate relations between the *poissards* and the throne. He might usefully have enlarged on this aspect of his subject and referred his readers, for example, to the *Gazette litt. de l'Europe* (1779) and the *Journal de Paris* (1781), which describe most vividly the behaviour of the *poissards* at the free performances staged for their benefit at the royal theatres.

I note one important omission in chap. iv, that of Baret's *Mademoiselle Javotte* (1758), a remarkable study of a Parisian prostitute and a faithful reflection of *poissard* language and *mœurs*. On p. 98 the Comtesse de Verrue, who is quoted as having died in 1736, is referred to as a member of an 'académie' which flourished from 1739 to 1776. On p. 126 Vadé and others are said to have created 'a democratic art which con-

stitutes a parallel to eighteenth-century neo-classic achievement'. This statement surely needs elaboration. I cannot agree either with the remark (p. 135) which implies that Caylus is more aloof from the people than Vadé. Is not this an illegitimate deduction from the fact that Caylus was an aristocrat and Vadé was not? But these are mere cavillings and in no way detract from the value of Dr Moore's work which is a monument of patient research.

There is, however, one very serious criticism which must be made. There is no index, and in a work of this sort an index is absolutely essential. May one hope that in a second edition this defect will be remedied for the benefit of those who wish to use the book as a work of reference? At the same time, the author will be well advised to eliminate such barbarisms as 'He became helper of the stage-setting in the Comédie Française' (p. 201); 'they even appeared before the Royalty' (p. 289); 'they decided to go on a lark to the Fair', etc. There is no valid reason why a work devoted to scholarship should be written in a slovenly manner.

F. C. GREEN.

CAMBRIDGE.

Le Socialisme et le Romantisme en France: Étude de la Presse Socialiste de 1830 à 1848. By H. J. HUNT. London: Oxford University Press. 1935. x+399 pp. 15s.

Mr Hunt has added an important chapter to the history of French literature in the nineteenth century by his scholarly analysis of the Socialist press from 1830 to 1848 in its relationships with the writers of the time. In the first part he discusses the various schools of Socialist thought, their theories, their criticisms, and the periodicals in which they gave these expression; the second part he devotes to authors and their reactions. Here there is some uncertainty in the arrangement of his material: he deals with it mainly under authors, but sometimes under ideas (cf. ch. xvii). The difficulty, however, arises from the very density of his materials, and his gropings are infinitely preferable to the framework technique of *thèses de série*.

The book and its appendices are full of valuable information not easily available elsewhere. The first part throws new light on the genesis of much of the literature of the period; in the case of Hugo, for example, with his ardent desire to voice the preoccupations of his age, the Socialist press is full of suggestions which have borne fruit. Thanks to Mr Hunt, students and superficial critics may at last realize what Hugo really meant by 'écho sonore'—a phrase as overworked and as misunderstood as Stevenson's 'sedulous ape'.

Although Mr Hunt is on the whole a shrewd and penetrating critic, he is a little apt to conclude that the established authorities in certain fields have said the last word on their subjects (cf. pp. 237, 255). The formula 'M. X. a tout dit sur Y' may be gratifying to the authority in question, but I doubt it. Great scholars know better than anyone else that on

literary questions the last word has never been said. Mr Hunt's own book may compel some of them to revise their views!

In a work of this kind a good index is indispensable; that of Mr Hunt is well compiled and admirably presented. The omission of a reference to Stendhal on p. 47 because he is there designated 'l'auteur de *Le Rouge et le Noir*' is a little disturbing, but this is probably an isolated case.

As the jacket (rather unnecessarily) assures us, the book is written in French throughout; a few Anglicisms of vocabulary (p. 40, l. 19) or construction (p. 254, ll. 4-5) have crept in, but on the whole the book is impressive in the dignity and lucidity of its French style. It will contribute much to a better understanding of French literature under the July monarchy.

M. E. I. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

I due Tempi della Composizione della Divina Commedia. By GIOVANNI FERRETTI. Bari: Laterza. 1935. 454 pp. L. 30.

All students of Dante must be grateful to Giovanni Ferretti for this book, even though few may be prepared to agree with all his conclusions. Accepting Boccaccio's evidence, Professor Ferretti maintains that the first seven cantos of *Inferno* were written before Dante's exile (and he suggests during the few months immediately preceding his exile), and that, when Dante was sent his copy while staying at the court of Marquis Malaspina, he was so rejoiced at this voice from a happier past reaching him that he refrained from recasting this section and was at pains to link up the following cantos of *Inferno* and to dissemble, as well as he could, the inconsistencies caused by the change his philosophical and political views had undergone during the intervening years. There are objections against this view so obvious that they need not be stressed, but every careful reader of Dante has felt for himself that the poet's craftsmanship improves out of all recognition after the first cantos, and many must feel how satisfactorily this theory would explain that difficulty away. And it would also justify the discrepancy which has often been remarked upon between the moral system described in Canto XI, which is based on Aristotle, and the mention in the first cantos of capital sins: a question for which it will suffice to recall the opinions of Moore (*Studies in Dante*, II), Reade (*The moral system of Dante's Inferno*), Busnelli (*L'etica nicomachea e l'ordinamento morale dell'Inferno*) beside that of Pascoli among many others. The principal merit of Professor Ferretti's book is that he surveys the whole question more thoroughly than ever before, considering in detail the evidence of Boccaccio and of the early commentators in the light of recent discoveries concerning the possible occasion during which Dante's copy may have been traced; and that he brings to bear upon the question a number of very ingenious remarks, which he supports with extraordinary ability and learning: as for example the different features Virgil and Dante appear to have in the first cantos, where they lack the dramatic power which they later acquire; the enhanced role of the damned as compared with the monsters

and the demons, Dante's altered outlook upon the classical culture, the disproportion in the conception of the infernal cavity and in the employment of time, the political question involved in canto II, the evidence of canto VI which seems to militate against the date 1301 and a number of other points; on all of which students of Dante must form an opinion, and will be helped towards a more reasoned opinion by Professor Ferretti's survey and subtle argument. Despite, and occasionally because of, his ingeniousness it is perhaps to be expected that his case will be considered as 'not proven', but this will in no way detract either from the merit of this work or from the debt in which students are placed by the author.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

Medio Evo e Rinascimento. By ITALO SICILIANO. (Biblioteca della Rassegna, XIX.) Milan: Società Dante Alighieri. 1936. xiv + 159 pp. L. 15.

It seldom happens that a book arouses so full and so cordial a consent, as, at least, the first section of Professor Siciliano's *Medio Evo e Rinascimento* must evoke from all that have true scholarship at heart. As the morbid desire to surprise the reader was at the root of many of the absurdities of Marinismo and euphuism, so in our age, the field of scholarship has been plagued by the unceasing output of works in which a partial truth, newly discovered, has been amplified into gross error; by building up theories that may strike the imagination of the unlearned, and thus provoke enthusiastic eulogies in daily and weekly periodicals, though they have no claim to the attention of the scholar. A notable example, but unfortunately not an isolated one, is J. Nordström's *Moyen âge et renaissance* (French translation, 1933); and Professor Siciliano, in a spirited refutation of the countless mistakes this work contains, passes in review many other books in which the same or kindred problems are discussed in the light of a solid factual information and sound common sense. Against the absurd conclusions of partial information and tendentiousness there is no better weapon than an appeal to the obvious; and Signor Siciliano is refreshingly unafraid of restating obvious facts. The first section of his book has an irresistible swing that enforces assent as well as admiration. Supporting his views on the authority of scholars such as Faral, Jeanroy, and others of the same calibre, he maintains that too much has been made of the so-called early renaissances of the eleventh and the twelfth centuries, too great a weight has been ascribed to some isolated passages and exceptional works, and that these early medieval awakenings have nothing to do with the Renaissance proper. He points out, what is too often overlooked in our morbidly nationalistic age, that medieval culture was not national, but 'universal', and that every attempt at localizing it, during the earlier middle ages, is an offence against history. In the later sections of his work he surveys the question of the rise of vernacular literature, particularly Provençal literature, and tries to define the essential character of the Renaissance. He holds that by over-stressing certain aspects of it (Christian feeling, philosophical

views, etc.) some recent scholars have lost sight of its complex features; and it is not the least merit of his work that it constantly keeps in touch with the arts, as well as with literature and philosophy, so that if on single points disagreement from his views will be possible, it must be difficult to dissent from Professor Siciliano's general conclusions. It is an eminently sane piece of work, a *mise au point* that will be useful to all students of the middle ages and of the Renaissance and that even specialized scholars will read with advantage on account of his references and of the first-hand familiarity the author has with the works he discusses.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

Poesía Española, Antología, I: Poesía de la Edad Media y Poesía de tipo tradicional. Por DÁMASO ALONSO. Madrid: Signo. 1935. 574 pp. 20 ptas.

GÓNGORA, *Obras Mayores: Las Soledades.* Nuevamente publicadas por DÁMASO ALONSO. Madrid: Cruz y Raya. 1936. 428 pp. 12 ptas.

La Lengua poética de Góngora, I. Por DÁMASO ALONSO. (Revista de Filología Española, anejo xx.) Madrid: Aguirre. 1935. 230 pp. 15 ptas.

The three very important works which Sr Dámaso Alonso has been able to give to the world since resigning his strenuous lecturing and tutorial appointment in Oxford can be grouped under one rubric: to do all in his power to make unpardonable either ignorance of, or indifference to, Spanish poetry among his compatriots. Foreigners may be excused, but what can be said of the repeated objection among Spaniards that medieval poetry is 'difficult', when it requires no more effort in that slowly evolving language than does the intelligent reading of Spenser among ourselves? It is true that the accessible texts are either the careless miscopyings of the 'Biblioteca de Autores Españoles', which multiply difficulties through sheer indolence and emphasize them by atrocious printing, or they are critical texts bristling with square and round brackets, contractions, italics, variants, and footnotes, a delight to the philologist and a horror to the general reader. The *Antología* takes away all that apparatus, and reproduces reliable texts in elegant print, which the veriest school-boy could read for pleasure. Apart from the poems we all expect to see, Sr Alonso shows his refined taste by drawing on the *Cancioneros* and popular lyrics which have been rather lost sight of since the days of Longfellow.

Similarly with Góngora. He is not obscure. 'No oscuridad: claridad radiante, claridad deslumbrante... Dificil claridad que nos satisface.' In 1927 Sr Alonso provided us with a modern prose rendering, not as a translation, but to aid the sluggish among us to read the poet we censured. To this he now adds the readings of the first form taken by the *Soledades*, with prologue and notes. We can thus see that intensification of stylistic usage which is typically Gongorine. The readings of the first

redaction, unless I am much mistaken, differ from the final text in being closer to the average level of Góngora's poetry; the final text passes through the crucible. Not all the changes does Sr Alonso admit to be improvements. He prefers as more vivid the 'en dehesas azules pace estrellas' to the ultimate 'en campos de zafiro pace estrellas'. But the latter shows at work Góngora's musical sense (richer vocalism, avoidance of too many sibilants), and his characteristic aversion from the concrete and particular when dealing with material things. We have no space to discuss the readings in detail, but only enough to insist on their great value for understanding Góngora's aims and measure of success.

The third work, *La Lengua poética de Góngora*, is the commencement of a most valuable contribution not merely to the study of Góngora, but to that of the Spanish language. Sr Alonso complains that philologists have not sufficiently busied themselves with 'cultismos':

Ahora bien, esos vocablos cultos son hechos idiomáticos (lo mismo que los populares) y deben ser, por tanto, objeto de la lingüística. Pero casi no lo han sido hasta ahora.

The fact is that the study of language began with literary documents, and a too violent reaction in favour of the spoken word has lead the 'Young Grammarians' to ignore literature, and even to identify spoken words with the mechanism of articulate sounds. Hence the celebrated 'phonetic laws'—hypotheses concerning the mechanical aspect of speech. Once established, the phonetic 'laws' must be combined with various mental 'laws' to explain colloquial speech; and the colloquial is both the source of, and the product of, the various forms of cultured expression, especially literature. The present treatise shows how much Góngora has done to make the Spanish language what it is, but the same has been done, in greater or less degree, by every poet, prosewriter, ballad-singer, monk or chancery clerk, in fact by everyone who has sought to improve his speech by mental control. The division between *voces cultas* and *voces populares* is shadowy, and ultimately false. *Fe, flor, Dios, Carlos, siglo, diablo, príncipe* (and the older *princepe*), *Córdoba, ambos, OSp. omne*, etc., have all been exempted in some respect or other from the operation of 'phonetic laws', but they are all at least as truly popular as, say, *artejo*. *Visto* has triumphed over *veído* because speakers grouped certain participles in their minds, but *veído* was also a rational proposal. The fact is that usage is constantly criticizing language, and, in such a language as Spanish, one of the criteria is—both for cultured speech and for the colloquial—ever more intense comparison with Latin. The study of Spanish, therefore, will hardly have begun until we have many more studies of that ignored three-quarters of the lexicon to lay alongside Sr Alonso's pioneering work.

As for the Góngorine *cultismos*, they are surprisingly cautious. The more flagrant Latinisms imputed to his school he does not use. His vocabulary is evidently that of most of his immediate predecessors, from whom he only differs—as they do among themselves—through his preference for certain concepts, which he reiterates. The difficulties of

syntax are much greater, and are part of a determined effort to appropriate the whole store of 'figures of speech' handed down by classical grammarians. But they, too, all have their precedents even in crystalline writers like Fray Luis de León. 'Góngora no inventa; recoge, condensa, intensifica.' It is through repetition and mass that Góngora stands out: 'repetición y agrupamiento'. By a skilful analysis of the dedication to the Duke of Béjar, Sr Alonso is able to show just how intense the style of Góngora becomes by this method. The dedication is more complex than most of the narrative parts of the *Soledades*, because in dedications, which are a formal exercise, the writer displays all his wares. For this reason, the technique of Garcilaso also is best studied in the first four stanzas of the *Égloga Primera*; indeed, the two pieces form a diptych, which I have often found it useful to compare when attempting to explain the differences between the two halves of the Golden Age. The 'culto' devices of Góngora, even in their intensity, may not be anti-popular. The formula 'A, si no B', for instance, is first-cousin to those negative comparisons which play such an important role in Russian and Serbian balladry, where they occur perhaps more densely than in Góngora. The periodic style which Góngora employed perplexes his countrymen, but has the same justification as the periods of Vergil and Milton: it was a necessity for a poet with sense of the complex possibilities of rhythm.

If Góngora's language was that of his time, it was a *fortiori* the language of himself at all epochs. Gone, therefore, is the myth of the 'angel of light' and the 'angel of darkness'. Góngora employs after 1611 nothing he had not already used quite freely: 'todo lo que Góngora usa después de 1611 lo había usado ya antes de esa fecha'. By a subtle analysis of the 'simple' ballad *Angélica y Medoro*, Sr Alonso proves the identity of the supposed two manners. To his analysis, which I have often done less well for pedagogic purposes, I would add one point. As in the *Soledades* the hero's name is entirely withheld, so in *Angélica y Medoro* the heroine's first appears as late as the 31st stanza, and that of Orlando—whose mad fury is the foil we must suppose for this whole idyll—is represented only by the *conde* of the last line. I should not even wholly exempt the few pieces Sr Alonso admits to be 'simple'. Simple they are; but they have a subtle interplay of metaphors, antitheses, plays on words, and groupings. For instance,

Viendo que sus ojos
a la guerra van.

Why *ojos* (lover)? Because (a) Góngora is here interchanging concrete and abstract as he so often does in the *Soledades*, and (b) because he expects a nimble-witted reader to leap from the literal *viendo* to the metaphorical *ojos*, though these are taken from the same class of concepts. It is simple; but it is subtle.

Yet there are, in a sense, two Góngoras, since the idealist and the jocose poet are quite different facets of one nature, and their clash goes on all his life. Sr Alonso shows how *venablo* 'hunting spear' is *chuzo* 'pike' in the mouth of the serious and jocose poets respectively. He excludes from his purview the study of Góngora's *lenguaje jocoso*. But I hope he

will include in his second volume a study of Góngora's wit and of his bathos. There is an undercurrent of wit, I think, in the *Angélica y Medoro*, for Góngora is surely not to be taken seriously when he heaps the luxuries of a palace on a forester's hut and attributes courtesy to a *villano malicioso*. The ballad is intentionally unreal, and meant to be read with a smile. As for the *Soledades*, I cannot believe that Góngora took them with entire gravity; his hero, for instance, is anybody or nobody. The question of Góngora's bathos is allied, but difficult. Yet I think that what Ticknor ridiculed is bathos, but that Ticknor should have laughed with the author, not against him. The elaborately patriarchal account of the billy-goat ('el que de cabras fué dos veces ciento esposo casi un lustro') is surely a mock-heroic introduction to the bathos of 'servido ya en cecina' (dished up as jerked mutton). We obviously must know, and from no one with as much credence as from Sr Alonso, what was the poet's attitude to his work. Had he no way of naming a spoon that he should call it 'the rare invention of old Alcimedon'? Was it pedantry of the epoch? Was it that Góngora, viewing his work with an artist's detachment, got as much entertainment from the interplay of the sublime and ridiculous as he did from that of the abstract and concrete? Why 'mortal fiera, esfinge bachillera', where the last word (pert) destroys the awe inspired by the three others? The art of Góngora is kaleidoscopic; in it one is never quite sure what is real or unreal, sublime or ironical, narrative or lyric, felt or feigned; one is only conscious of unfailing virtuosity.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Geschichtsauffassung und Erzählungstechnik in den historischen Romanen F. D. Guerrazzis. Von W. THEODOR ELWERT. Halle: Niemeyer. 1935. vii+176. 10 M.

Modern criticism has been inclined to consider Guerrazzi chiefly as a political phenomenon or as a personification of certain extreme *risorgimento* tendencies, often underrating the aesthetic value of his literary work. He was not a great writer, but his novels deserve more attention than is usually accorded them. The present objective study is therefore welcome, especially as it makes no extravagant claims to place Guerrazzi higher than his due. The title promises rather more than it actually fulfils, for of all Guerrazzi's novels that can be claimed as historical only the *Battaglia di Benevento* and the *Assedio di Firenze* are adequately studied. Now that Croce and others have analysed the tendencies of the nineteenth-century historians in Italy we can well understand the description of Guerrazzi, the historical novelist, as a *ghibelline* with a *Geschichtsauffassung* similar to that of Botta, and the informed reader may find unnecessary the somewhat laboured elaboration of this statement here. Guerrazzi's position in regard to Scott is sufficiently defined though his later debts to Sterne are barely mentioned. The emphasis on terror, mystery, blood, and violent death, perhaps the most remarkable feature of Guerrazzi's novels, is rightly associated with the previous

Schauerroman (Radcliffe, Walpole, Lewis, etc.), but the author fails to appreciate the wider significance of this element of romantic literature. Professor Mario Praz's book on the subject is not included in the bibliography and we feel the present author would understand Guerrazzi better if he had studied its implications. It would also have helped him to define the Byronism of his subject.

Herr Elwert is anxious to stress the differences between Guerrazzi and Manzoni but he neglects similarities. The humorous ironical asides (quoted on pp. 108, 109) are very typically Manzonian. 'Man wird auch eine typische Eigentümlichkeit dieses Stils bemerkt haben, . . . die Tatsache, dass Der Autor sich unmittelbar an den Leser wendet, mit ihm gewissermassen ein Gespräch führt.' Here too one thinks of Manzoni with his 'Lascio poi pensare ai lettori'; 'Pensino ora i miei venticinque lettori' etc.

Guerrazzi himself wrote to Carlo Leoni that he had tried to write 'poemi in prosa' rather than novels, and many of both his virtues and defects come from this inclination. It is therefore useful to find here a careful examination of Guerrazzi's rhythmical prose. In this respect it is curious to find this author discounting the influence of Chateaubriand on Guerrazzi.

Herr Elwert's study shows all that meticulous care we expect from a German *Dissertation* but sometimes the apparatus seems more formidable than the findings warrant.

E. R. VINCENT.

CAMBRIDGE.

Recherches sur le judéo-espagnol dans les pays balkaniques. Par C. M. CREWS. (Société de Publications romanes et françaises, xvi.) Paris: Droz. 1935. 319 pp.

Mrs Crews has published the thesis which she submitted for the degree of Ph.D. in London, and she is to be congratulated on the importance and thoroughness of her work. The collection of texts makes it one of the richest chrestomathies of Jewish-Spanish, and the notes and vocabulary greatly add to its value. The dialects illustrated are those of Bucharest, Salonica, Bitolj and Skoplje (or Üsküb). With regard to the Rumanian variety of Jewish-Spanish Mrs Crews has to report that a pure tradition can no longer be found: 'Il n'y a aucune famille à Bucarest parlant habituellement le judéo-espagnol.' The resemblance of the national speech to Spanish is such as to deprive the latter of its special cachet; French, the language employed by the Alliance Israélite Universelle, exerts a disruptive influence; there are no Jewish-Spanish journals, schools, ghettos, etc. As it was Mrs Crews's first intention to study this dialect alone, its corrupt tradition must have been a serious set-back. She transferred her interest to Bitolj in Yugoslavia before learning that Mr Max Luria had made a study of the Monastir dialect. At Bitolj the material was richer, and Mrs Crews found that her informant Nahman Halevy did not confine himself to the formulas he had given to Mr Luria. Here also Esther Cohen proved to be a perfectly authenticated witness. 'Aveugle et célibataire. Au cours de sa vie, elle ne s'était jamais éloignée

de plus de quelques mètres de la rue dans laquelle elle naquit. Elle ne comprenait que le judéo-espagnol, et, bien-entendu, ne savait lire ni écrire'. Two younger informants enabled the writer to gain an idea of changes recently introduced. At Skoplje satisfactory dialect-speakers were available. The Salonica dialect is important as holding something like a key-position with regard to those of the north-western Balkans.

The ground has been examined by M. L. Wagner and Subak, among others, and several pages of Mrs Crews's introduction are necessarily occupied with recapitulating their conclusions. She is able, however, to put a finer point on some of their observations. At Salonica, for instance, she finds the retention of *f* is not occasional but absolute. Forms like *avlar eço izo* are due to literary norms, but only *ermozo* is established in the dialect itself (and *fermozo* occurs in proverbs). At Skoplje *ermozo* is again the exception, and *f* remains 'sauf chez ces personnes qui ont consciemment adopté une façon de parler "plus raffinée"'. At this point Mrs Crews is both able to verify Subak's brief note on the town, that its colony came from Salonica with its dialect, and to establish some small points of difference (such as the commencement of fairy-tales in *era(n) buen de* and not *eran buenoz de*). One point incidentally established is the failure of traditions and ballads (*consežas i romanses*) among the Rumanian Sephardim.

Very few first books have been so mature and authoritative as Mrs Crews's *Recherches sur le judéo-espagnol*.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Livros Antigos Portuguezes, 1489-1600, da Bibliotheca de Sua Majestade Fidehssima (Early Portuguese Books in the Library of His Majesty the KING OF PORTUGAL. In three volumes. Vol. III, 1570-1600 and Supplement 1500-1597.) Printed by the Cambridge University Press for Maggs Bros.: London. 1935. xli+791 pp. £25 net the set.

It is six years since the publication of the first volume of King Manuel's invaluable Catalogue delighted the heart of scholars and bibliophiles. Three years later the second volume, fully worthy of its predecessor (and what higher praise?) appeared, and the King's death occurred in the very week of its publication. He lived long enough to see the reward of years of long work. This reward was certainly very dear to King Manuel, for he loved his books and not only mastered their contents but read many other works bearing on the same subjects and works of criticism concerning them, in Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, German, French, Latin or English. 'The King's description of his books', says Mr Stanley Morison in one of the three brief prefaces to the third volume,

is thorough; he aimed to recreate not to embalm. The books were more than texts; more than documents. It was first nature for him to observe the details of his books. The King was a collector who knew with a precise mind what it was that he collected. His equally precise eye inevitably noticed, in detail, the character and decoration of the binding, the traces of former ownership, the paper, the margins, the illustrations, the typography: the whole of the book, its craftsmanship, quality and condition....

Few collectors have known their books as thoroughly as King Manuel. It is impossible to read his account of the items which gave him greatest pleasure . . . without realizing that the King brought to it an appreciation at once enthusiastic and judicial. As he expressed it himself in one of his letters, 'When writing, I was thinking that *Veritas et justitia super omnia* is always true'.

The scholar's love of truth and accuracy and keen eye for detail were lit up with the generous enthusiasm of the humanist. Working night after night alone into the early hours of the morning, the King considered no trouble too great, no detail insignificant in his constant resolution to recreate round the bibliographical kernel the delicious fruit of Portugal's many-sided achievement in the sixteenth century. The Catalogue opens with the year 1489, the date of the second book published in Portugal (of the first King Manuel had been unable to obtain a copy) and ends in the year 1600. The books of the first eighty years were personally described by the King, often in essays, literary and historical, extending to scores of pages (in parallel columns, English and Portuguese). The books of the years 1570-1600 are included in the third volume, which also contains a long supplement describing earlier books omitted in vols. I and II. It has also a recent photograph of the King, a page of his manuscript and a page of proof copiously corrected in his handwriting. The three volumes contain in all 414 items, of which only 120 belong to the volumes published in the King's lifetime. The third volume is longer by over a hundred pages than either of its predecessors. Compared with them, it has a cold perfection. The King's living touch is absent; there are no glowing elaborate essays to illuminate the first edition of the *Lusiadas* or of the *Contos* of Trancoso. One turns back with eagerness to the information contained in the earlier volumes concerning many of the writers of the books described in the third and last. But all has been done that could be done. It is a noble book; print, binding and illustrations are as magnificent as those of the former volumes. One can well believe that the illustrations, chosen by Miss Margery Withers, King Manuel's librarian, are, as Queen Augusta Victoria says in her foreword, 'such as the King himself would have wished to reproduce'. Miss Withers is to be congratulated especially also on the fullness and accuracy of the collations. Hearty congratulations are due also to Messrs Maggs and to the Cambridge University Press on the conclusion of a princely undertaking. The book is a present delight to scholars, and at no distant day it is likely to be eagerly sought after by bibliophiles and will soon be unobtainable. It is certainly cheap at its price of £25 for the three volumes; but many who will continually spend six and ten shillings on worthless volumes will think many times before paying a round lump sum for what may be described as a real bargain. The book is a worthy tribute to the sensitive learned scholar King Manuel the Unfortunate, last King of the great House of Braganza, and to the glories of Portugal's Golden Age.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

MANIQUE DE BAIXO, PORTUGAL.

A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary. By J. F. BENSE. Part I, Aam-Dowel. 1926. Part II, Doxy-Keeler. 1930. Part III, Keelful-Plash. 1932. Part IV, Plast-ment-Smeary. 1935. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.

This dictionary of the Low-Dutch loanwords in English, which is now approaching completion, is the result of some twenty years' study by a Dutch scholar whose previous book, *Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third* (1925), was intended as a literary and historical introduction to the present work. The author has collected his material from the pages of the *New English Dictionary*; he has also consulted Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary* and Professor Weekley's *Concise Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* (1924); Professor Wyld's *Universal Dictionary of the English Language* (1932), which was available to him for Part IV at least, he does not appear to have used. He has also gathered up a number of dialect words from Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*. In his Preface to Part I he states that he has included: (i) all words that are considered to have passed from Low-Dutch into English, not omitting a considerable number of Low-Dutch origin that have passed at one time or another into English by way of America, South Africa, and other originally Dutch settlements, as well as words from other languages which entered the English vocabulary via Low-Dutch; (ii) all words of obscure or doubtful origin that seem to him to be possible borrowings; (iii) all words that are said or supposed to have been derived from sources other than Low-Dutch, but which may, on further investigation, prove to be of Low-Dutch origin. With about four-fifths of the *Dictionary* completed, the author has examined some 3200 words, including nearly 800 words that are now obsolete in English and over one hundred that were never naturalized or only partially naturalized. This total, out of a vocabulary of nearly a quarter of a million words listed in *N.E.D.* and its Supplement, is not an imposing one, but Dr Bense rightly stresses the important part that many terms of Low-Dutch origin have played in the evolution of English. Where he has no further material to give, he contents himself with transcribing the articles in *N.E.D.* But even here he often makes illuminating and valuable comments. Occasionally, he is able to make important additions; thus, he antedates the first recorded mention of S.A. *kopje* in *N.E.D.* by more than half a century, and that of *mealie* by two centuries. He has read the *N.E.D.* articles critically and not infrequently makes what will be recognized as valuable corrections of the etymologies there given: *burlap* cannot well be derived from Du. *boenlap* (*N.E.D.*), but may be from an unrecorded Du. **boerenlap*, which probably had the meaning 'coarse cloth', and was formed on the analogy of Du. *boerenkost*, literally 'peasant fare', hence 'coarse food'; for *dunnage* he makes the interesting suggestion that this is a corruption of the Du. adverb *dunnetjes* 'lightly' in a seaman's phrase like *Leg 't er dunnetjes op* or *tusschen* 'stow it lightly'; *firkin* is derived by *N.E.D.* from an unrecorded M.Du. **vierdekijn*, but the M.Du. word—which was very common—was *vierdel*, *ve(e)r^{de}l*, and gave mod. Du. *vierdeel*; Dr Bense agrees with Weekley in deriving from

Du. *vierde* 'fourth' and the Engl. diminutive *-kin*. No further light is thrown on the origin of *huckster*, which is omitted, although Weekley and Wyld have accepted Du. origin; the author accepts *hawker*, but suggests as its source M.L.G. *haker* 'retail-dealer' rather than the cognate M.L.G. *hoker*, Du. *heuker* (*N.E.D.*). The arguments adduced for regarding the following as Low-Dutch borrowings are not convincing: *blink* vb., *blister* vb. and sb., *bluster* vb., *cackle* vb. and sb., *clink* sb.² 'prison, lock-up', *crack* 'to brag, boast', *dam* sb. and vb., *dool*, *dole* 'boundary, landmark', *knob* and its dial. variant *knub*, *knop* (M.E. *knoppe*, *knappe*, probably < O.E. *cnæpp*); *pad* 'toad' which occurs in the Peterborough Chronicle s.a. 1137, and *paddock* 'frog' which goes back to the thirteenth century; *plash* sb. and vb., and its dial. variant *plosh* 'to splash, bespatter'; *cob(b)* 'gull' is probably native Engl.; it occurs occasionally in place-names, e.g. *Cobholm Island* near Great Yarmouth; *dote* vb. (M.E. *doten*, *dotien*) must go back to an O.E. vb. in *-ian*; *groom* sb. is probably from O.E. **grōma*, derived from *grōwan* on the analogy of O.E. *blōma* sb., from *blōwan*; *oaves* (c. 1220) is probably from an unrecorded O.E. **ofes*, a side-form of O.E. *æfese*, *efses*, and cognate with O.H.G. *obasa*; *quap*, var. of *quab* sb.¹ 'eelpout' may well be native: it occurs in *Whaplode*, co. Lincs. (D.B. *Copelade*, 1212 *Quappelade*). On phonological grounds, *miche* sb.² 'forked shaft for a pump; wedge for sighting a cannon' and the allied *mitch-board* 'support for a boom or yard' cannot well be from M.Du. *mic(ke)*, which may be the origin of the obsolete *mike* 'crutch or forked support on which a boom rests when lowered'; whether the vb. *shut* (O.E. *scyttan*) owes anything to Du. or L.G. influence (M.Du. *scutten*) must be considered very doubtful.

According to *N.E.D.* the NthCy. *hag* '?hedge; wooded enclosure; coppice' is first recorded c. 1470; Dr Bense therefore assumes that it cannot be derived from O.N. *hagi*; but the fact that a word is first recorded in the written language at a comparatively late date is surely no proof that it cannot have existed in English long before. This will apply more especially to topographical terms. Not many of these, encountered all over the country, are likely to be of M.Du. or M.L.G. origin. The author claims as Dutch or L.G. the sb. *dell*; but O.E. *dell* 'deep hollow or valley' is recorded, and occurs occasionally in place-names, as in *Arundel*, co. Sussex (D.B. *Harundel*); *dene* sb.¹ 'sandy tract by the sea; low sand-hill' occurs in Yarmouth *Denes* and is probably native; *groop* (c. 1440) 'trench, drain, channel, etc.' goes back to O.E. *grōp* 'ditch, drain'; the obsolete sb. *repple*, which apparently meant 'narrow strip', can be traced back to 1033 (Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus* Ch. No. 752); the M.E. form *repel* suggests that it is a side-form of O.E. *ripel*, from an unrecorded O.E. **ripul*, **reopul*, and cognate with Norw. *ripel*, *repel*; cf. Ekwall, *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Engl. Pl.-Ns.* s.n. *Repps*.

Dr Bense is happiest when he is discussing words that have long been regarded as undoubted Low-Dutch borrowings; there are wholly admirable notes on a large number of sailing terms and on such words as *decoy*, *kayles* and *slim*—to take a few at random. In his enthusiasm and his anxiety to prove Low-Dutch provenance for certain compound words

he occasionally 'protests too much', and hardly makes due allowance for the genius of the English language in forming new compounds at all stages in its history. *May-lily*, *-month*, *-moon*, *-thorn* are probably translations of Du. compounds; but one does not see why *May-day*, *-eve*, *-fish*, *-kitten* could not have been formed in English independently of their Du. synonyms; incidentally, we miss the late borrowing *May-drink* (1850), from Du. *meidrank* or G. *maitrank*, possibly the latter and therefore perhaps omitted. Of the series *mete-line*, *-pole*, *-rod*, *-stick*, *-wand*, *-yard*, some of which are of respectable antiquity in English, not every one need have been formed from Du. *meet-lijn*, *-roede*, *-stok*, etc. respectively.

It is perhaps churlish to point out the omission of a few rare words like *samoreus* (1622), a kind of boat used on the Rhine; but the author will agree that the following should have found a place in the *Dictionary*: *lampas* sb.², originally a kind of glossy crape (M.Du., e.mod.Du. *lampers*) found in *lampas douck* (a. 1548 Hall's *Chronicle*); *to misdeal*, used by Caxton in the sense 'to distribute unfairly', like Du. *misdeelen*; *rummer* (1654) 'a kind of large drinking-glass', from W. Flem. *rummer*, *rommer* or Du. *romer*, *roemer*, rather than L.G. *rómer*; *schinkel* (a. 1634) 'ham, gammon', from Du. *schinkel* 'knuckle, shinbone' (cf. Du. *schink* 'gammon, ham').

It is stated on p. xvii of the Introduction that the word *market* was already borrowed from O.N.Fr. in the late O.E. period. The evidence for this is based on the occurrence of the word in a charter of Edward the Confessor to Ramsey (Kemble, *Codex Diplomaticus*, No. 853); but this document is of very doubtful authenticity and in any case a medieval text. The earliest genuine reference is in the Peterborough Chronicle, s.a. 1125. It is suggested s.v. *cant* sb.¹ that Kent, 'originally called *Cant*, *Cantium*', is M.L.G. *kant* 'Winkel'; O.E. has only *Cænt*, *Cent*; the form *Cant* is a spurious one, and the name—probably Celtic—can have nothing to do with the M.L.G. word. Dr Bense wonders whether the *Holland* division of Lincolnshire has any connection with the Netherlands. It appears in Domesday as *Hoiland*, and, like *Holland*, co. Essex, and *Down-* and *Upholland*, co. Lancs., is derived from O.E. *hō(h)land* 'land on or by a hill-spur'. Elsewhere in England the pl.n. *The Hollands* is not uncommon; this is usually a corruption of earlier *The Hollens* 'the holly-trees', from O.E. *holegn* 'holly'. These names therefore do not indicate Low-Dutch settlements in England; as an instance of early Flemish settlements on the East coast Dr Bense might have quoted *Flempton*, co. Suffolk (D.B. *Flemingtuna*), which represents a pre-Conquest **Flemingatūn*.

A word of praise is due to the printers of this work. It is an admirable example of Dutch typography at its best. A few printer's errors have been encountered: p. xxvii, l. 5: for *Strond* read *Stroud*; there is no 'river Stroud' in Gloucestershire; p. 8, col. 2 foot, for *thsi* read *this*; p. 11, col. 1, s.v. *berkyne*: for *fijn* read *fijn*; p. 17, col. 2: s.v. *Boor's Mustard*: for *Baurenseufe* read *senfe*; p. 20, col. 1, s.v. *bought*: for O.E. *byght* read O.E. *byht*; p. 63, col. 2, s.v. *cricket* sb.¹: for O.E. *cryce* read O.E. *crycē*; p. 137, col. 2, s.v. *halshband*: for *brauch* read *branch*; p. 139, col. 1, s.v. *happer*:

for *East Wrotham* read *East Wretham*; p. 142, col. 2, l. 1: for *Gomer's* read *Gower's*; p. 168, col. 1, ll. 4 and 8, s.v. *knob*: for O.E. *cnæp* read O.E. *cnæpp*; p. 372, col. 1, s.v. *shock* sb.¹: for O.E. *scoð* read O.S. *scoð*.

O. K. SCHRAM.

LIVERPOOL.

Die Erweckung der Walküre. By WILHELM LEHMGRÜBNER. Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. 109 pp. 3 M. 80.

The central problem is to examine the relation of the 'Erweckungssage' and the 'Werbungssage'. Schneider maintains that he has exploded the myth of an 'Erweckungssage' (*Arkiv for Nordisk Filologi* 45), but the assurance with which, in the face of great difficulties, he does it makes his conclusions unconvincing. Each source in the various traditions must be analysed separately.

The author treats the Norse tradition first (pp. 6-51), as it is the oldest. In *Sigrdrífumál* and strophes 40-44 of *Fáfnismál* he finds evidence of a song about the awakening of a maiden. The sources dealing with the 'Werbungssage' are discussed in so far as they throw light on the 'Erweckungssage'. From this analysis the author concludes, in opposition to Schneider, that there was an 'Erweckungssage', and that most of it is embodied in the 'Werbungssage'.

The German tradition is taken next (pp. 52-73), with a view to establishing whether it supports the conclusions reached, and whether it can add any traits to supplement the picture. The author regards the passages in the *Nibelungenlied* which suggest that Siegfried and Brünhild were already acquainted when Siegfried obtained her for Gunther as evidence of a previous meeting. This postulation would be greatly strengthened if we could find indisputable evidence of an 'Erlösungsdichtung' in Germany. The author considers that the *Hürnen Seyfrid* supplies this evidence. Further evidence of the release of the maiden he finds in *Seifrid de Ardumont*, in the episode of the serpent surrounded by fire (260 ff.). The sources of the mixed tradition, *Thidrekssaga* and the ballads, are not sufficiently reliable to supply new evidence. The 'lectulus Brunihildae' is to be regarded as a support for the argument that the 'Erweckungssage' is of German origin, and old.

In section F the author attempts a reconstruction of the original, German, form of the story; this original form he thinks, in opposition to Panzer, is intimately connected with the story of Sleeping Beauty. In the concluding section he finds that there is nothing in the German sources to invalidate the findings based on the investigation of the Norse sources, in fact some of them are substantiated. Therefore he concludes: the awakening of the maiden was the subject of one of the original songs about Siegfried; this, together with traits from the other Young Siegfried stories, supplied material for a new song, in which the characters of the 'Burgundensage' were introduced, and this song was the first source of the 'Werbungssage'; Siegfried was still the only one who could win Brünhild and so now he does it for Gunther. The objection to this theory

is that the deception of Brünhild, which is the mainspring of the action, arises by accident!

Many of the author's conclusions, including that on the origin of the 'Werbungssage', are based on insufficient evidence, and there is little in the book that is new. Its chief merit consists in gathering and arranging in convenient form the principal arguments that have been advanced against Schneider's theory.

K. C. KING.

LONDON.

Christi Leiden in einer Vision geschaut. Herausgegeben von ROBERT PRIEBSCHE. Mit Bildnis und Schrifttafel. Heidelberg: Winter. 1936. xi+49 pp. 3 M. 50.

The Memorial to Robert Priebisch could not have taken a more suitable form than the posthumous publication of medieval German text editions prepared by himself. The Memorial Fund Committee here presents the first. It opens with appreciations of the man and his work, by German and English scholars who had the good fortune to be his colleagues or pupils.

Certain features characterise this and all editions by Professor Priebisch. Greatest accuracy in the presentation of the text, brief but adequate annotation and a scholarly introduction with absolute relevance and economy of reference. Further, he invariably selected for publication works in some way unique in content or style. *Christi Leiden*, here published for the first time, is a work of considerable interest and originality.¹

The framework of the story can be found in countless instances in the literature of the Mystics (to which *Christi Leiden* ultimately belongs): a pious person desires to suffer as Christ suffered and is, in a vision, witness of his Passion, from the descent from the Mount of Olives. But in style and in part in treatment of sources and subject matter, *Christi Leiden* is unique in the (hitherto published) literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The style is one of unrelieved realism. From the moment when Christ is taken prisoner after the betrayal, the work is a succession of harrowing descriptions of the brutalities of his enemies, and of his own silent sufferings. The descent from the Mount of Olives, the taunting, the

¹ Professor Priebisch based his edition on a Rhenish-Franconian MS. of the fifteenth century. Shortly after having undertaken to review his edition, I was led by an entirely different investigation to go systematically through various catalogues of German MSS., and made a discovery which I am sure would have been gratifying to Professor Priebisch, had he lived to hear of it. There is a second version of *Christi Leiden* in MS. germ. oct. 449 (41v.-80r.), beginning however 'En güt mensch waz eins mals etc. (= Priebisch, 3r.)' (see H. Degering, *Kurzes Verzeichnis der germanischen Hss. der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek*, III, p. 148 (1932). I have had this MS. photographed and made a collation of the two texts. A critical edition is not possible. The Berlin MS. is in parts so different from Priebisch's, that the above report must be considered as applying to the one text only. I hope to publish in the near future edited versions of two long and important plus-passages of the second, selected variants and notes on Priebisch's edition. Dr Christ of the Preussische Staatsbibliothek informs me that the Berlin MS. 'ist in letzter Zeit häufig und von verschiedenen Seiten benutzt worden' (answer to an enquiry of 3 August 1936). On the other hand, no communication seems to have been offered to the ZfdA. or the ZfdPh.

flagellation, the crowning with thorns and the crucifixion are gruesomely detailed and lingering scenes. The climax is the fall of the erected cross with the crucified.¹ The morbidity of these passages is not (in Priebisch's version) relieved by lyrical lamentations, prayers or invocations, never absent in anything but the most prosaic of the chronicles of the Mystics. The physical sufferings of Christ are the subject of the work; the mental agony finds little direct expression. The language is correspondingly direct and forceful, but undisciplined.²

The author of the Rhenish-Franconian version is conscious of a bold and original treatment of the story of the Gospels, which is here '*irnthwet unde gerithet unde geordent*' for '*wol geubethan menschin* (1r.)'. The four Evangelists wrote briefly and, for their times, adequately (a corresponding statement, later in MS. germ. oct. 449). The embellishments consist mainly in the amplification of the sufferings of Christ and in increased emphasis on his passivity and isolation. Further, in the blackening of the characters of his enemies. The just Pilate of apocryphal, and the merciful Longinus of later medieval tradition are hypocritical and Sadistic respectively.³ The Jews are possessed of, or are themselves, devils.

The author has a marked dramatic and even theatrical sense. The threefold *quem queritis?* and the threefold casting down of Judas and his following of devils,⁴ the interviews with Pilate, the flagellation and even the crucifixion are strongly reminiscent of the corresponding scenes in the medieval Passion Play, though chronological difficulties make one hesitate to press the affinities. Monographical treatment of *Christi Leiden* is called for.

F. P. PICKERING.

MANCHESTER.

Die dichterische Selbstdarstellung im Roman des Jungen Deutschland.

By E. A. GREATWOOD. Neue Forschung. (*Arbeiten zur Geistesgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker*. 29.) Berlin: Junker and Dünhaupt. 1935. 175 pp.

Take a literary movement which produced few works of permanent value; select an aspect which excludes these few; omit the non-Aryan element, and finally subject the whole to the levelling process known as *Geistesgeschichte*, and the result lies before you in the present book.

The title of this study tells its own tale. By limiting himself to self-portraiture in the novel, Dr Greatwood was obliged to sacrifice to his theme the work and personality of Ludolf Wienbarg, who receives only

¹ Cf. *Alsfelder Passionsspiel* (ed. C. W. M. Grein, Cassel, 1874) where Annas suggests that the cross be allowed to fall (p. 174)!

² In MS. germ. oct. 449, 80r. the original author's admission: *heinricus dewildenholcz/non bene scribo sed melius discere volo* is copied. (Abbreviations resolved.)

³ On Pilate in the Passion Plays, see J. E. Wackernell, *Altdeutsche Passionsspiele* (Graz, 1897), Introd. p. clii. One finds a just Pilate in the *Alsfelder* and *Heidelberger* (ed. G. Milohsack, Bibl. des Litt. Ver., 1880) *Passionsspiele*, and generally a merciful Longinus (but not, for example, in the *Sterzinger Spiel*, in Wackernell, *op. cit.*).

⁴ Cf. Wackernell, *op. cit.*, pp. 53 ff.

ten pages in a book which devotes the same space to the thoroughly mediocre Gustav Kühne. Was the theme so rigidly limited in order to exclude Börne and Heine? They are summarily dismissed in the opening chapter, because neither ever wrote a novel, and could therefore have no direct influence on the *genre*. I must emphatically protest against the underlying assumption that literary influences operate strictly within the limits of the various *genres*. And I will add, that to embark on a study of self-portraiture in the Young German novel, and to ignore the master of self-revelation who was (if not the leader of the movement) the solitary jewel in its crown, is to attempt the dismal feat of producing *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark.

The study, once one has resigned oneself to the loss of Börne and Heine, and to the scant attention paid to Wienburg, proves to be well documented and provided with an excellent bibliography. Dr Greatwood has studied his authorities carefully, refers to them constantly, and quotes from them frequently. (Page 35, note 6 should read Prölss and not Pralss.) He is also thoroughly well read in the period; and the student of this movement will experience real pleasure in refreshing his memory by reading Dr Greatwood's book. He will rarely be moved to disagree with the author's findings, which are based on sound common sense; but he will not, I imagine, feel at the end, that he knows Wienburg, Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Kühne much better than he did before, nor that any new light has been shed on self-portraiture in the novel. Opinions, and not persons, really interested these writers; and I am inclined to think that a more fruitful line of approach would have been through their theory and practice of *Tendenz*. Taking the study as it stands, however, and granting the scrupulous fairness of its meticulous investigation, I submit that it suffers from the prevalent complaint—*Geistesgeschichtitis*—a disease which saps the vitality of the authors and works who contract it. It is a democratic disease, bringing down the man of genius to the level of the hack-writer. But since Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Kühne were not men of genius, little harm has been done in the present instance by inoculating them with the germ; and, on second thoughts, one should perhaps feel grateful to Dr Greatwood for allowing Heinrich Heine to go free.

E. M. BUTLER.

CAMBRIDGE.

Ludwig Tieck, the German Romanticist. A Critical Study. By EDWIN H. ZEYDEL. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1935. xvi+406 pp. \$3.50 (16s.).

While German critics write about Romanticism and Romantic theory, scholarship outside Germany is, it seems, turning more and more to the Romanticists. Brentano and Chamisso have recently been treated in detailed monographs by French scholars. To them is now added Ludwig Tieck, of whom Professor Zeydel, of the University of Cincinnati, gives 'the first full-length biography since 1855', the date of Köpke's very readable but somewhat anecdotic and not impartial work. Haym's

severity has no doubt been largely responsible for this eclipse; but it is even more remarkable that of the other writers on whom the light beats much more fiercely than on Tieck—the Schlegels, for instance—there are still no complete biographical accounts—a major obstacle to research on any member of the Romantic school.

Professor Zeydel did not set out to write a 'Rettung' of Tieck. His book is the culmination of many years' untiring work on the external data of the poet's life and writings, on his unpublished work, the real nature of which he reveals and summarizes for us here, and on his unedited letters. Fruits of these researches have appeared from time to time in the shape of important editions, essays and a considerable work on *Ludwig Tieck and England* (Princeton, 1931).¹

Tieck scholars, mindful of the difficulties he has faced, will have constant need of the full and authoritative information on the whole course of Tieck's life which Professor Zeydel has collected for his latest work. There is, moreover, in every chapter an abundance of facts on Tieck's relations with and repercussions in foreign literatures. But it is on this, the external, side that the book's main strength lies. When so much needs to be investigated from this point of view, there are two dangers which the author does not altogether avoid; that small personal details may receive as much emphasis as facts of vital literary significance, and that a critical survey of the poet's work may take second place. Tieck's position in literature is, indeed, only sketchily treated, in observations scattered through many chapters and collected in an all-too-brief final summary.

The study of Tieck's mental structure, too, suffers from its having to be undertaken by instalments in the course of the narrative of his life. This leads inevitably to some repetition, and the author is denied an extended opportunity of following out his findings to their ultimate conclusion. We learn of the imaginations and hallucinations of Tieck's boyhood and youth, of his life in a world of make-believe and his tragic disillusionment. Tieck was a Romanticist from the outset, desperately lonely and helpless if he could not live with his dreams and fancies, if he could not assume some part or other to save himself from the agonies of reality. This points ultimately to Haym's conclusion, that it was his character to have no character at all, but Professor Zeydel will not have it so. It also explains his lack of lasting popularity, as it is only one stage removed from that ironic aloofness with which he surveyed and pilloried the world of cheapness and vulgarity, all the more cheap and vulgar when seen from the golden heights of fancy.

On the biographical side Professor Zeydel sheds much light; and not on Tieck alone. The private lives of the Romanticists—their loves and quarrels—form a constantly moving background. Two points of detail may be mentioned; Tieck can hardly have become acquainted with *The White Devil* until the spring of 1794 (not 1792, p. 318), in vol. III of Dodsley's *Collection of Old Plays*, which he borrowed from the Göttingen library on March 29th; it would be interesting, further, to have the evidence for the statement that Bouterwek perhaps prompted Tieck's

¹ Cf. the late Professor J. G. Robertson's review, *M.L.R.*, xxviii (1933), pp. 130 sq.

Spanish studies (p. 114), a statement that was made by Körner in 1911,¹ but not repeated by Bertrand.²

Finally, the book, as Professor Zeydel himself warns us, is not so much 'abschließend' as 'aufschließend'. In spite of its sacrifice of a well-rounded critical appreciation to narrative and synopsis, and in spite of its eclecticism and certain stylistic imprecisions and infelicities, its appearance will be welcomed with gratitude by Tieck scholarship everywhere, and the further edition of Tieck's letters which the author has undertaken, awaited with the keenest interest.

A. GILLIES.

HULL.

The Proverb in Ibsen. Proverbial Sayings and Citations as Elements in his Style. By ANSTEN ANSTENSEN. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. xii+255 pp. 17s. 6d.

This analysis of Ibsen's use of proverbial sayings contains a considerable amount of new material, and suggests an interesting method of approach to the text of his plays. Professor Anstensen has extended to the whole of Ibsen's work an investigation originally confined to *Peer Gynt*; and this drama occupies a central position in the book. Writing as one whose native tongue is Norwegian, the author attributes the 'peculiar suggestiveness' of Ibsen's poetic production in no small measure to the large amount of proverbial material absorbed into his language—sayings which, when transmuted into poetry, reflect in an arresting way universal human experience (p. 247). He has therefore subjected every proverb, proverbial phrase, proverbial allusion, and citation—this classification is adopted specifically for the purposes of his present investigation—to a careful analysis, identifying citations, tracing allusions to their sources, and suggesting analogies for sayings in proverbial guise which are not precise quotations. The collection of data of this kind is a heroic task, and in this instance its difficulty is increased by the fact that the critic had to recognize many of the allusions at sight, from compilations of proverbial sayings in Danish and Norwegian and from his own knowledge of such sayings. In the Introduction he defines the twofold object of his search: the collection of the data, and the analysis of Ibsen's purpose in using proverbial expressions. Of these two aspects, the second is the more interesting and important. But while the evidence is set out very fully and with meticulous care, the conclusions drawn from it occupy comparatively little space. After a brief chapter in which he defines the scope of the inquiry and indicates the lines of his investigation, Professor Anstensen examines the plays in turn, grouping them under the headings of historico-romantic dramas, satiric verse dramas, and modern social plays. The account of the second of these groups contains the most substantial results of his research. *Peer Gynt* provides convincing evidence for Ibsen's conscious use of quotation as an aid to character

¹ *Nibelungenforschungen der deutschen Romantik*, p. 25, which speaks of romance literatures generally, rather than Spanish in particular.

² *Cervantes et le romantisme allemand*, Paris, 1914.

delineation, with satiric or ironic purpose. Professor Anstensen is led from this to draw some parallels between *Peer Gynt* and other characters—e.g. Stensgård, Bernick, Hjalmar Ekdal—who show traces of the 'Gyntish strain' (p. 221); and to those primarily interested in Ibsen as a dramatist, these comparisons from a new angle are perhaps the most interesting of his suggestions. In the final chapter, Professor Anstensen presents some further results of his inquiry into Ibsen's methods of using proverbial expressions. He finds deliberate purpose in the unusual frequency with which the dramatist adapts or quotes popular sayings: he used them 'to help create or to intensify a certain mood; to sum up a certain idea or sentiment, in order that he might the more effectively confirm or deny it; to sharpen the shafts of satire, and to delineate human characters' (p. 236). But perhaps the most suggestive passages of the Conclusion are those in which the author analyses the development of Ibsen's technique in the use of proverbial sayings, showing the gradual increase in skill of satirization, the growing complexity of character portrayal, and the deliberate cultivation of a *Leitmotiv* effect. He stresses the 'ethical undertone' in Ibsen's work and finds it strengthened by his adaptation of familiar expressions to a specific situation; and he suggests an interesting connexion between the dramatist's satiric use of such expressions and his rooted dislike of the ideas and sentiments of 'majorities'. It is perhaps permissible to wish that Professor Anstensen had expanded some of the suggestions in this final chapter; but he has given us at least a useful contribution to the study of Ibsen's work, based on a very close and detailed scrutiny of an interesting aspect of his style.

EDNA PURDIE.

LONDON.

German Literature of the Mid-Nineteenth Century in England and America as reflected in the Journals 1840-1914. By LILLIE V. HATHAWAY. Boston: Chapman and Grimes. 1935. 341 pp. \$3.

This interesting work of Professor Hathaway is a valuable addition to the general investigations into the attitude of England and America towards German literature. It deals with a clearly defined and restricted field, 'that period which lies between the literary movements of "Young Germany" and what was once called "Youngest Germany"; from approximately the late thirties to the eighties'. As the author states in her preface, 'many of the facts set forth are neither new nor startling', but in a book which is very carefully and systematically constructed, and very thoroughly documented, she has presented them in a form both agreeable and convenient, and one which aids us in appreciating the significance of the mass of material under review.

The book consists of chapters dealing with Lyric Poetry, Drama, the Novel and the Short Story, followed by a Conclusion, and a Chronological List of References covering a wide selection of English and American Periodicals for those seventy-five years. There are also two graphs, showing the fluctuations of interest in the various decades, in the one on the basis of total references, and in the other of significant articles only. The

length of the first three chapters, 18, 26, and 64 pages respectively, probably represents with fair accuracy the appeal of the various literary genres in the two countries.

In Lyric Poetry interest was chiefly shown in the lesser poets, and particularly the revolutionary poets of 'Young Germany'. Freiligrath was the most popular of all—next to Heine, whose omission, for the two-fold reason that M. H. Haertel (*German Literature in American Magazines, 1846 to 1889*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1908) 'has already made a careful study of him as far as America is concerned', and that his place is so assured, tends to give this section a somewhat unreal perspective.

In the Drama we find very much the same state of affairs. Halm was enjoying a boom in the forties, when Grillparzer was hardly discovered; 'a translation of Sappho in 1855 was the first attempt to introduce Grillparzer to the English reading public at large.' Yet it is refreshing to find as early as 1852, two years before *Der Fechter von Ravenna*, a critic in *Fraser's Magazine* calling Halm a dramatist 'next in repute to Grillparzer but far below him'. It was only with the present century that any real understanding of Hebbel began to appear. Before that he had been tentatively introduced as 'the Browning of Germany', and critics showed great ingenuity in finding suitable epithets for him and 'his morbid taste for the horrible and monstrous'. Even now the fame of those two great nineteenth-century dramatists, to say nothing of Ludwig, is very limited in range. Professor Hathaway is probably right in saying that 'in England and America to-day the name Grillparzer conveys little or no meaning to the average reader', and that 'Hebbel has remained a dramatist for the few and outside of academic circles he is even now little known in England and America'.

For the Novel and the Short Story we have a different picture. German novels in the earlier part of our period had in general the reputation of being heavy, long-winded and pedantic, but there were notable exceptions. Auerbach and Freytag enjoyed great popularity, while somewhat later Spielhagen was much read. During the seventies and eighties the historical and archaeological novelists enjoyed a great vogue, the chief favourites being Freytag, Ebers and Dahn. The Short Story never suffered the same damning reputation, and a whole series of writers were popular in both countries, especially Rosegger, Storm (chiefly *Immensee*), and above all Heyse, while the large German population in America which could read them in the original was no doubt responsible for the vogue of 'the *Gartenlaube* ladies' and of the lighter fiction generally. Keller, however, was long in coming into his own, though to-day the author finds that, in America at any rate, the realization of his greatness, which she formulates in words of Professor J. G. Robertson, is ever growing.

Dr Hathaway's book furnishes much food for thought. It is interesting to consider German literature from this particular angle, but it must have a somewhat chastening effect to contemplate this document of the fallibility of human judgement and of the contemporary popularity of the second best.

H. G. ATKINS.

Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century.

By ETHEL SEATON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. xvi + 384 pp. 15s.

The chief aim of Miss Seaton's book, which is the third in the series of *Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature* edited by Professor H. G. Fiedler, is 'to hold the mirror up to the English ignorance and gradually clearing knowledge of Scandinavia during the seventeenth century', though she does not ignore the reciprocal growth of Scandinavian knowledge of England. The plan is broadly chronological, dealing first with travel and trade, then with political ties and diplomatic relations which facilitated the visits of Scandinavian scholars to England and the interchange of learned correspondence, and then the consequent growth of English antiquarian interest, with two more general chapters on popular superstitions and on the Scandinavian impress on English literature. There is also an appendix on references by Scandinavian visitors to English plays, and another on some gifts to the Bodleian Library, and a useful classified bibliography.

The breadth and, in general, the clarity of the book are as admirable as the learning, and only two mild complaints may be suggested. One is that the necessity of packing much into one volume, combined with the scholar's feeling of obligation to support statements and give references, sometimes leads to overweighting and sometimes to awkwardness of arrangement—it is, for instance, possible that the long and interesting discussion of the difficulty which English and Scandinavian scholars found in getting books, and the valuable notes on Northern books in English libraries and English books in Scandinavian libraries (pp. 258 sqq.), might have come more happily earlier in the book than in its actual position. The other complaint is allied to this: in her courtesy and modesty Miss Seaton assumes rather more detailed knowledge of the Scandinavian background than is likely to be possessed by any but a small proportion of her readers. How many are familiar with 'the miserable affair of Leonora Christina, Countess Ulfeldt, which must ever remain a blot on the 'scutcheon of Charles II' (p. 70), or even with the rise and fall of Griffenfeld (pp. 162–4)? There are other instances of the same allusiveness; in a later edition Miss Seaton may make more concessions to those who have not her easy acquaintance with State papers.

It is pleasanter as well as more just to notice how clearly in the main the theme is developed, and how thorough the investigation has been. In the sixteenth century Hakluyt and George North, followed later by Purchas, stand out for their care in inquiry into the truth of reports, as against such careless propagators of absurdities as Boorde and Nashe. In the seventeenth century itself the importance of the embassies is rightly stressed: the fact that such men as Marvell, Bodley, Algernon Sidney, Temple and others of similar qualities of character and learning were representatives of England, in one capacity or another, had consequences in the history of literature and learning as well as of politics; ambassadorial or secretarial friendliness helped the correspondence of Camden with Vedel (unfortunately not, as Miss Seaton notes, on ballads); of Sir

Henry Spelman with Olaus Wormius, of Harvey with Thomas Bartholinus, of Hicks with Peringskiöld and Salanus; and such Scandinavian ambassadors as 'Arnold Hwitfeld' were equally helpful. After the Reformation Scandinavian scholars, who would formerly have visited only Rome and Paris, came also to England, attracted later in the period by the Royal Society and the Bodleian Library, which detained many for long sojourns and led to the formation of personal and scholarly friendships. 'Nearly all these Danish scholars who have intercourse with England are doctors by profession and antiquarians by hobby' (pp. 164-5), and when they were not exchanging professional information with English colleagues they were enlightening English antiquarians on Northern history, law, topography and other matters. The passage on the study of runic writing (pp. 223-31) has some of the interest of a detective story, from Daniel Rogers's acquisition of three 'Gothic alphabets' to Purchas's discourse on 'Gothike letters', Spelman's correspondence with Wormius on runic letters—including 'one of the tallest feathers in the cap of English septentrional study', Spelman's immediate recognition of the derivation of the word *runic*—and so presently to Hickes's *Grammatica* and *Thesaurus*. It is worthy of notice that Dryden knew what was meant by 'Runick Rhimes' (pp. 234, 256-7). From this to the study of 'Danish' monuments, which for many seventeenth-century antiquarians included Stonehenge as well as the Bewcastle and Ruthwell crosses, and to the old Northern religion—indeed, to comparative religion (cf. pp. 251, 253-4)—is a natural process; and Miss Seaton does not exaggerate when she points out that 'it may almost be claimed that comparative study in all branches was in the seventeenth century first made possible by the knowledge of Scandinavian antiquities; for with the exception of Hebraic antiquity there had till then been no known code of ancient manners to set over against classical antiquity either as a parallel or as a criterion' (pp. 202-3). The old religion and the later superstitions were closely connected, but it is odd that Miss Seaton, though she observes the 'traces of old Norse mythology' in the accounts of Swedish witches, appears to accept without question the explanation of the trials as being due entirely to fanaticism and hysteria, and not to consider the possibility of a real survival and recrudescence of pre-Christian cults (pp. 291-3). In the last chapter she discusses the nature of the Scandinavian impress upon English literature in the period, from the story of Syrithe, which first appears in 1578, to more questionable borrowings of whose doubtfulness she is humorously aware. It is not only those who are 'septentrionally excited' who will hope that she will be able in the future to follow up some of the loose threads which tantalize her—even that she may herself discover the letters of Sir Thomas Browne to Theodorus Jonas.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

The fifteenth volume of the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* (edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by Mary S. Serjeantson, assisted by Leslie N. Broughton. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes. 1935. 296 pp. 7s. 6d.) continues to provide an indispensable tool to all workers in its wide field. Dr Serjeantson introduces some new methods of classification, in her constant attempt to increase its usefulness and to facilitate reference. The alternative of a classified index is certainly not to be recommended. As it is, indeed, it is a question whether there is not some difficulty in the classes of, say, 'Biography' and 'Academies, etc.', much of the material in which might well be looked for under the respective 'Century' classes. This involves duplication of entries. The classification of the linguistic sections, as Dr Serjeantson points out, is a thorny problem.

There remains the question of the section on the Twentieth Century, with its necessary decisions upon the permanence of the matters recorded. The section has already outstripped in length all others except that allotted to its immediate predecessor, the Nineteenth Century. It is a very generous allowance indeed.

Once more we express our thanks to Dr Serjeantson and to Professor Broughton, as also to the scholars in many countries to whom they owe contributions towards the completeness of this record of work.

C. J. SISSON.

Dr J. W. Mackail's graceful presidential tribute to A. C. Bradley, and Professor C. Foligno's authoritative account of Edmund Gardner's life and work (*Andrew Cecil Bradley, 1851-1935, and Edmund Garratt Gardner, 1869-1935*. From *The Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. xxi. London: H. Milford. 1936. 10 pp. 1s. and 18 pp. 1s. 6d.) recall to us two great Fellows of the Academy whose loss we lament. Dr Mackail bears witness to the attractive personality and the abiding influence of an English scholar whose studies were built upon classical and philosophic foundations, and whose principal work, *Shakespearean Tragedy*, is an enduring monument of critical literature, a classic in its own right. It is earnestly to be desired that to the printed memorials of Bradley's great and fine mind should be added his two series of Gifford lectures. Who could so well supervise their publication as Dr Mackail himself?

If the *Modern Language Review* owes a tribute to this notable collaborator in its earlier career, it owes more to its Romance Editor for so many years. Professor Foligno sets forth Gardner's qualities as a man, his achievements as an Italian scholar, and the spirit in which he lived and thought, in a manner which is the more impressive for its restraint and judiciousness, and which expresses no less his affectionate comprehension of a great colleague and friend. Both tributes are worthy of their subjects, of their audience, and of their authors.

C. J. SISSON.

Dr M. M. Bhattacharje of Calcutta University, who previously produced a dissertation entitled *Studies in Spenser* in which he dealt, among other topics, with the question of Bruno's influence, has now published a little volume, *Platonic Ideas in Spenser* (Longmans, Green, and Co. 1935. xii+200 pp. N.p.) which will be interesting to students who are anxious to distinguish the varying degrees of the poet's debt to Aristotle, Plato, the neo-Platonists, and the French poets. The author is acquainted with most recent work in these fields, and draws largely upon it, but he is not a mere compiler of the best that is known and thought; he has made careful analyses of the significant characters in *The Faerie Queene* and is led thereby to differ from one or other of his predecessors at many points in his discussion of what Spenser meant by Temperance, Chastity, Holiness, Friendship, Love or Beauty. One may question whether in general he adds much to the interpretations of W. L. Renwick and Miss L. Winstanley, but he calls into notice some unregarded features of several minor allegorical figures, and emphasizes skilfully the way in which Spenser's thought was almost everywhere shot through with diverse and not always compatible ideas. Professor Legouis, in an appreciative foreword, writes: 'The philosopher in (Spenser) is merely a disciple of the ancients, somewhat hesitating and perplexed between his pagan masters and the teaching of Christianity.' Like many other recent writers Dr Bhattacharje shows Spenser as the disciple of Renaissance thinkers also, and he might with advantage have had even more to say about Renaissance interpretations of Aristotle and the Platonists.

G. BULLOUGH.

Professor Elton's British Academy Shakespeare Lecture (*Style in Shakespeare*. From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. xxii. London: H. Milford. 1936. 29 pp. 1s. 6d.) insists rightly upon Shakespeare's love of words, his connoisseurship in words, and refers to the many examples of the poet's critical passing remarks upon style, all pointing away from that negligence which writes with ease and towards 'studious art', to use Professor Elton's phrase. It is in the light of this preliminary that his subsequent survey of the changing, varying tides of Shakespeare's style through poems, comedy, history and tragedy is to be read, and it is all-important. The range and suggestiveness of this discussion, in small compass, are the outcome of a packed and subtle mind. Here is critical wisdom, too, that recognizes the limitations of the office of criticism, not least in the exegesis of Shakespeare.

C. J. SISSON.

Mr Harold Child's zestful lecture to the Shakespeare Association upon *The Shakespearian Productions of John Philip Kemble* (London: H. Milford. 1935. 22 pp. 2s.) is the quintessence of the widest knowledge and understanding of his subject and its problems. We are not able to assure ourselves, after reading Mr Child, that Kemble took his own good intentions very seriously. The times were against him, in any case. There was, in fact, little to choose between Kemble's actual treatment of the

venerated dramatist and that of his Indian admirers in later days. Both shared one set purpose, to put or to keep Shakespeare on the stage and to ensure a hearing for him in such guise as the time and the place permitted. But Kemble gave thought and consideration to more advanced ideas which bore fruit in due course. Mr Child puts the case with all fairness to Garrick's great successor.

C. J. Sisson.

Miss Anna Baesecke in her *Das Schauspiel der Englischen Komödianten in Deutschland* (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, LXXXVII), Halle, 1935, has made an important contribution to the study of dramatic form in earlier German plays. Although the limited scope of the dissertation has enabled Miss Baesecke to concentrate her attention on a comparatively small group of plays, it has made difficult her task of differentiating the qualities of style and structure of these plays from those of plays outside the group. Indeed, as Miss Baesecke admits, the close similarity relating the plays she is discussing with some of Ayler and the 'Wanderkomödianten' almost defies differentiation. The analysis of the growth of form and structure is acute, but a balance has not always been maintained between the varieties of form and their inter-relation.

Miss Baesecke purposely does not discuss sources and theatrical history but accepts the findings of Creizenach, Tundolf, Cohn and others without much question. This habit has led her into making questionable assumptions. Thus the statement that the plays of the English Players were not influenced by religious or political matters needs much more confirmatory evidence than Miss Baesecke has adduced. Similarly, it would have been better if a closer study had been made of the position in Elizabethan drama of the plays that were transplanted, Miss Bradbrook's *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*, for example, would have given much profitable information. Too, some attempt might have been made to clear up the English—or even the early German—associations of *Tiberius von Ferrara* before using it as evidence. If it owes anything to Glapthorne's *Lady Mother* then it is tainted by a style alien to that of the plays under discussion, even as the same writer's *Albertus Wallenstein*, though transformed in Germany, seems from the summarized text in the Berlin play-bill to have been only imperfectly assimilated.

These slight omissions do not sensibly lessen the importance of Miss Baesecke's work, for her main argument is proven by well-documented evidence.

J. H. WALTER.

In *The Early Middle Class Drama, 1696-1774* (Lancaster, Pa. 1935. 213 pp. \$2.00) Mr Fred O. Nolte sets out, not to retell the history of bourgeois tragedy and pathetic comedy, but to survey critical opinion concerning them in England, France and Germany. He suggests that this middle-class drama was a characteristic product of the Age of Enlightenment, with England as its intellectual and literary source. A study of earlier domestic drama, particularly the Elizabethan, leads him to believe in the essential independence of the eighteenth-century type, with its dominating concern for humanitarian at the expense of aesthetic

values. Much interesting material is gathered together in his discussion of the attempts of European critics to define its distinctive qualities and to vindicate the propriety of bourgeois characters and interests against the aristocratic tradition of drama. The volume should serve a useful purpose as an introduction to any study of the plays themselves.

F. E. BUDD.

Dr Max Arnim Korn's *Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts* (Forschungen zur Englischen Philologie. Jena. 1935) is a model introduction and guide for serious students of Swift, and has little to criticize beyond misprints in the English extracts for which the press is no doubt answerable. We were first of all struck by the ample bibliography, which we soon found to be an integral part of the work, representing the witnesses on one side or the other called by the author, and all carefully examined, before he comes to his judicial summing-up. Each is sufficiently annotated, either in the text or in the abundant footnotes, so that the changes of authoritative opinion on Swift can be traced from his own day to this. Perhaps there does not exist a better, or at any rate a more compendious, résumé of the literature of the subject. Herr Korn's study is admirably systematic, and as thorough as was possible in less than 150 pages. He sets Swift in his proper perspective, in relation to the thought and the religious attitudes of his day, the political parties and the factions these gave birth to, and the general state of society and culture. He decisively disposes of the old-fashioned charges of misanthropy, pessimism, and irreligion. Swift was first and foremost a man of affairs; he was what may be termed a practical thinker, with no interest in metaphysics or the abstractions of a theology that trenched upon metaphysics. But he was a man of fixed principles, with a stable creed which he was prepared to maintain against both political and religious sectaries. Among the parties of his day, with their changing views, he stood firm as an enlightened Whig, 'not sensible of any material difference' from some who called themselves Tories, but a stern critic of those who were called the new Whigs. This consistency and conservatism are traced in the *Tale of a Tub*, *Gulliver*, and the other works, including the correspondence.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

The recovery of Smollett in our age has been marked by the appearance of some rather dry studies in which American scholars have been the pioneers. Now Dr Eugène Joliat attempts to make some amends to him for the disdain which his works (all save his *History of England*) met with in France. A good part of this book (*Smollett et la France*. Paris. Honoré Champion. 1935. 279 pp. No price) is devoted to explaining the causes of that disdain which are not very far to seek and might indeed be guessed. More usefully, perhaps, the author traces Smollett's models among French picaresque writers, including of course his avowed model Le Sage. All that is very well done. M. Joliat turns the tables on Smollett (Sterne's nickname for Smollett) by asserting that the startling advance in art and urbanity between 'Sir Launcelot Greaves' (1760) and

'Humphrey Clinker' (1771) was due to his long vacation in the south of France in 1763-5. 'C'est sur la Côte d'Azur que l'insensible et vaniteux Roderick, le féroce et détestable Peregrine, devaient disparaître pour faire place au bonhomme Bramble.' Which renders the ingratitude of his Francophobia all the more detestable! A valuable study.

G. KITCHIN.

Mr J. L. Smith-Dampier has brought zeal and enthusiasm to the making of *Who's Who in Boswell?* (Oxford: Blackwell. 1935. xx+366 pp. 10s. 6d.), in which he has collected further information about most of the people, and some books and places, mentioned in the *Life of Johnson*. But it is difficult to see what public will be served, for most editions of Boswell have notes sufficient for the ordinary reader, and the student will still turn to the authoritative pages of the Birkbeck Hill-Powell edition or to Mr A. L. Reade's *Johnsonian Gleanings*. The attempt to combine biographical index and almanac—fitting each article to a page and calling it a day—makes both unsatisfactory. References are rarely given, and there are some inaccuracies of phrasing: for example, Guthrie (and Johnson after him) did not report 'imaginary parliamentary debates' in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, even though they no doubt drew on their imagination in writing reports of the real parliamentary debates they were not allowed to attend. Apart from such slips, however, the book achieves what it sets out to do, and it is attractively produced.

H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS.

The Letters of John Keats (Oxford University Press. 1935. lxxix+561 pp. 12s. 6d.) is a new edition by Mr M. Buxton Forman, in one volume, of the two-volume edition published in 1931. It is cheaper; it also contains ten letters not found in the first edition. It is revised, thoroughly annotated and indexed, is convenient and well printed, and in all respects admirable.

No new side of Keats's mind is revealed in the additions, but there is the authentic sparkle and seriousness in them. Two, addressed to Thomas Richards and William Mayor respectively, add new correspondents to the list. A note to Haydon tells that the young poet had met Wordsworth on Hampstead Heath on December 31st, 1817. Three are to his sister Fanny. One, of December 1818, laments much waste time in that year, and tells his joy at being able to study and write again. The second is a series of answers to a catechism on the sacraments of the Church of England from 'your affectionate Parson, John'. The third is the last letter written to her before he sailed for Italy. A short letter to Jane Reynolds, full of teasing and banter, first printed by Amy Lowell, now comes into the standard English collection. In a short note at the end of 1818 Keats tells Mrs Wylie of a sore throat, and another, to William Haslam, begs for £30. The longest of the new letters is one written to his brother George, dated November 1819. Real ills were upon them, which he had sworn he could bear better than imaginary ones. Money was short for both. Keats was still hoping that *Otho the Great* would be accepted at Drury Lane, but there was little substantial good to report. 'Nothing could have in all its

circumstances fallen out worse for me than the last year has done, or could be more damping to my poetical talent.'

In his Preface the editor gives a list of letters written by Keats to various correspondents, which are known of, but still unlocated. More perhaps remain to be discovered. This edition contains all that are available.

W. D. THOMAS.

Newspaper Headlines: A Study in Linguistic Method, by Heinrich Straumann (London: Allen and Unwin. 1935. 263 pp. 10s.), is a pioneer work in the field of linguistic theory. Headlines is a distinctive type of written language which has never before been the object of scientific investigation. It is related in character to the language of telegrams, diaries, book-titles, chapter-headings, dictionaries, etc., and in spoken language it is most closely resembled by the common phenomenon of ellipsis. Dr Straumann calls this whole group 'block-language', and it is precisely this group that has in the past given rise to the greatest difficulties in any linguistic analysis. Dr Straumann contends that 'the fundamental defect in modern language research' is 'the confusion of formal with semantic principles', and he proposes a new method of approaching the description of Modern English, proceeding from the purely formal aspect to a consideration of the position of the word within the word-group, then the context of the word-group, and finally the historical and social background. The author carries out these principles in a systematic survey of the forms of headlines in English newspapers, and the system, at least in this comparatively restricted sphere, reveals itself as for the most part simple and workable. He rightly emphasizes throughout the great importance of the common knowledge or cultural background which makes semantic understanding—as distinct from grammatical understanding—immediately possible. Introductory chapters deal with matters of psychological and historical interest, and trace the gradual development of the headline from the seventeenth century. The whole work deserves careful study.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

I cannot imagine a more attractive introduction to French poetry for senior pupils than *An Approach to French Poetry*, by Ruth Harrison (London: Victor Gollancz. 1935. 294 pp.). Dr Harrison very sensibly takes poetry for granted and talks about her poets in a simple and straightforward manner. Nor does she succumb to the temptation of dragging in third-rate poets in order to make her anthology 'different'. Here we have the tried favourites and the true metal. The publishers deserve a word of praise for a charming example of book-making. Altogether this is a fine performance.

F. C. GREEN.

Mr J. G. Legge has chosen his title well: *Chanticleer: a Study of the French Muse* (London: Dent. 1935. 395 pp. 8s. 6d.). It strikes a note of challenge, of gaiety and of great clarity, and these are the outstanding qualities of this anthology. It has, however, other features to recommend it to all those wise people who elect Mr Legge as their companion and

guide on this voyage of exploration. The author does not intend *Chanticleer* to be a school book and, in the bad old sense of the word, this is not a school book. But it is a book which should be in every school library. I cannot imagine a more charming experience for a girl or boy (or for that matter a tired business man since it is now agreed that all business men are tired!) than to read Mr Legge's luminous account of the development of French lyric poetry and to follow, when his French stumbles, the excellent renderings of the spirit of the original which, always at the appropriate moment, appear to illustrate the story. I am full of admiration for the gallantry and talent of Mr Legge. How few there are in this country who could have undertaken and accomplished with such success the difficult task of translating some hundred and fifty poems selected from the whole gamut of French poetry! After that, it is mere peevish pedantry on my part to say that I prefer the 'snows of yester year' to the version given by Mr Legge, though it is possibly a shade more accurate. And for those who know French so well that they do not need translations the author has printed the originals. An admirable idea excellently realized.

F. C. GREEN.

The *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch* is to be congratulated on reaching its seventeenth volume and maintaining its standard of excellence (Herausgegeben von Friedrich Schneider. Weimar: Böhlau. 1935. vi+1214 pp. 14 M.). The editor, who has recently produced an admirably lucid and up-to-date introduction to the study of Dante (*Dante. Eine Einführung in sein Leben u. sein Werk*. Weimar: Böhlau), has again arranged an interesting number. The first article 'Die Musik im Zeitalter Dantes', was originally a lecture and displays many interesting views on a subject of considerable importance, which has not been treated *ex professo* since the appearance of Bonaventura's well-known work, and is still deserving of careful study. In this connexion the researches of Drs Li Gotti and Pirrotta (*Il Sacchetti e la tecnica musicale del trecento italiano*. Florence: Sansoni. 1935) are breaking new ground and promise to give important results. This book, however, appeared too late to be of service to Dr Hermann Zenck. Dr Gerhard Ledig provides an essay on 'Die Göttliche Komödie unter strafphilosophischem Gesichtspunkt', in which a difficult subject is rapidly surveyed: the author seems to have overlooked a good many books and essays directly and indirectly bearing upon his subject, and to have merely concerned himself with some German and Italian publications; despite this he has made remarks and suggestions which will repay consideration. Dr Karl Hampe contributes an article on 'Die Abfassung der "Monarchia" in Dantes letzten Lebensjahren', a vexed question, of which this article can scarcely be held to provide a definitive solution, for even those who have ascribed the words 'sicut in paradiso comedie iam dixi' to Dante, must realize that they cannot be so glibly introduced into the text for several reasons and firstly because they are not reducible to the rules of the *cursus*; so that I still fancy that they must be explained away in some such manner as I attempted to do myself in an article that shares with many others the fate of being

unnoticed by the author. Also the survey of the historical conditions and events to which the *Monarchia* may refer is much too brief and uncorrelated to the opinions of scholars who have worked in this field to carry conviction. After a short communication on 'Das Dantesiegel von Cornelius Bock' due to the Duke of Saxony, there follows a very thorough survey on 'Das Problem einer Neuherausgabe des Lana-Kommentars' by Helmud Schröder, which does not attempt a full classification of the manuscripts but is a thoughtful statement of the difficulties involved and clearly shows the way along which the editor of Lana's commentary will have to proceed. Dr Theodor Ostermann provides an admirable and most useful 'Bibliographie der deutschen Dante-Literatur 1928-30', comprising well over 250 entries, to which is appended a valuable supplement to the author's *Dante in Deutschland* which appeared in 1929. There follows an article by Walter Goetz on 'Die Entwicklung des Dantesbildnisses' which surveys the whole question in the light of Frassetto's *Ossa Dantis*. Finally the Editor contributes a careful study of the persons in the Casino Massimo of Rome which are the work of German romanticist painters, and an excellent review of the valuable edition of the *Commedia* (Bergamo, 1935) with particular regard to the importance of the illustrations on the history of Dante's fame and of Dantean studies.

C. FOLIGNO.

Under the guidance of Professor W. L. Bullock when he was at the University of Chicago, Mr Frederick R. Bryson has carried out a thorough survey of the literature concerning the duel and the point of honour in sixteenth-century Italy. Pending the publication of a larger work, he gives us in a separate volume what he calls its introduction (*The Point of Honor in Sixteenth-Century Italy: an Aspect of the Life of the Gentleman*. New York: Publications of the Inst. of French Studies, Columbia University, 1935. vii+129 pp. \$1.50). Although the subject hardly falls within the purpose of this Review, one might perhaps contend that this is indeed a generous introduction to the specific subject of the duel, whereas, in dealing with problems connected with 'honour' in sixteenth-century Italy, it seems to skirt wider but necessary implications. But Mr Bryson means to be informative above all, and in this light his little book, with its good indexes and bibliography, will certainly prove useful to the student of the subject. Some of the authorities he quotes have been rescued by him from obscurity or practical oblivion, and, incidentally, the popular misconception according to which the subtleties of *pundonor* were brought into Italy by her Spanish rulers is implicitly exploded in his book.

C. PELLIZZI.

Professor Vincent was happily inspired in choosing Foscolo's *Sepolcri* as a subject for his inaugural address (*The Commemoration of the Dead*. Cambridge University Press, 1936. Sm. 8vo. 61 pp. 2s. 6d.), not only because, as M. Julien Luchaire has written, the *Sepolcri* is one 'des plus grands poèmes lyriques de toutes les littératures', but also because Foscolo, if ever any Italian poet, has consciously endeavoured to link

together the literatures of England and Italy. In less than 300 lines he has provided the masterpiece of funereal poetry and thereby killed a fashion that had long enjoyed favour during the eighteenth century. In studying Foscolo it is well to bear in mind that he was endowed with a miraculously retentive memory, and Prof. Vincent rightly points out that the destructive search for 'sources' is seldom as ill-advised as when dealing with Foscolo's works. What he wrote about Dante could be pertinently applied to him '... molta, se non forse tutta originalità viene al genio dalla attitudine ad arricchirsi di tutto e da tutti, a fare suo proprio d' altrui, a rimodellare, a immedesimare ogni cosa, sia straniera o antichissima, tanto da trasformarle che assumano le sembianze e le qualità confacenti a nuova età e altro popolo' (*Opere*, III, 118). He claimed to have been inspired to write the *Sepolcri* by two conversations at Verona and in a villa near Venice in 1806, but it may well be that some details, as that concerning Nelson's burial, should be traced back to the recollections of events of the early months of that year and to his intercourse with English prisoners in the Pas de Calais as Professor Vincent suggests; and he may be also right in assuming that Foscolo had read Count Silva's adaptation of Hirschfeld's *La Théorie de l'art des jardins*; Professor Vincent makes a good point by indicating a contradiction, which had not been hitherto observed, between ll. 51-3 and ll. 114-18, 130-2. Perhaps M. Caraccio is right in suggesting that the composition of the *Sepolcri* proceeded by fragments, and that the links between them are not always so well wrought as to be indistinguishable. Another interesting observation in a discourse in which good observations abound, is that concerning Byron's fourth canto of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, which contains a clear reminiscence of the *Sepolcri* (st. LIV). As for the 'appeal made by the *Sepolcri* during the Risorgimento' it scarcely needs explanation and illustration for the whole poem is given unity by patriotic feeling. As M. Caraccio aptly says, 'un patriotisme forcené fait la synthèse de toutes les connaissances, de tous les sentiments du poète'.

C. FOLIGNO.

One of the conclusions we are invited to reach through Professor W. Gottschalk's *Die bildhaften Sprichwörter der Romanen* (I, *Die Natur im romanischen Sprichwort*. Heidelberg: Winter. 1935. xvi+279 pp. 7 M. 50) is that, in the present state of our knowledge, no inferences of a general nature can be safely drawn. Popular attempts to interpret national character through national proverbs are defeated by the contradictory tendencies of the proverbs themselves and by their international circulation. It is not even certain that 'die Romanen' constitute a paroemiological family. It is possible to state when a given proverb is to be found in the Bible or in Classical authors, though that may not always be tantamount to a declaration of origin; but it is not possible to apply other tests, e.g., rhyme, to determine where a proverb arises. The material is enormous, and most readers who glance at Dr Gottschalk's bibliography will be able to suggest additions. The service the book can render is thus restricted to that of a classified catalogue. In that respect

one must deplore its typographical arrangement in solid, bristling paragraphs. The book presumably started life as a collection of *fiches* with headings such as 'Weather', 'Wolf', etc., and proverbs arranged in columns. That arrangement should have been retained, both to enable the reader to see at a glance all the parallels cited, which have now to be peered for in the greyish print, and also to permit of numbering and cross-reference by numbers. There is not really any continuous exposition such as would justify the arrangement in paragraphs set solid, and the author's attempts to provide links between *fiches* lead to an irritating series of *perogrulladas*, such as 'Es ist ohne weiteres begreiflich, dass das Wetter eine beachtliche Rolle im Sprichwort spielt'!

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

A new periodical in the field of Romance Philology is *Vox Romanica*. The editors are J. Jud and A. Steiger, the latter serving as managing editor; the publisher is Max Niehans of Zurich and Leipzig, with Mlle Droz as French agent. It is to appear twice annually, to amount to 400 pp., and to cost Sw. fr. 22. In a foreword the editors call attention to the linguistic advantages offered by Switzerland, where four languages live together in a small space. Most of the articles, however, are written in German. It is a happy coincidence that this periodical should appear just one hundred years after the first volume of Diez's epoch-making *Grammatik*. W. Meyer-Lübke deals with the development of *g j* in Romance. These two Latin sounds must have given the same result at different dates in the different territories. E. Tappolet, whom two other contributors congratulate on reaching his 65th year (may we add the felicitations of the *Review*?), discusses uncertainty of gender in French, particularly in words commencing with a vowel and not obviously feminine in form. L. Spitzer has a note on (*en*)*soñar un sueño*. B. Migliorini discusses Italian nouns (type: *bracciante*) formed with the suffix *-ante*, but not necessarily from a verb. J. U. Hubschmied proposes Gallic **sanio-s* **dwi-gro-s* and **mapo-skarpā* or **makko-skarpā* as etyma for certain technical terms in milking and cheese-making. A. Barth has an amusing note on *apache* showing the routine spirit in which much of our work is done. The word has no connection with Fenimore Cooper, and the *apaches de Belleville* were a figment of a journalistic imagination. He also discusses the phrase *pouvoir quelqu'un*. P. Aebischer explains It. *resina risina* (also a place-name) as originally used of the shallow gullies running down from the cone of Vesuvius, and then used of a steep track (as they are when dry) or torrent-bed. Among the reviews is an appreciative notice of Professor Mildred Pope's *From Latin to Modern French*. The volume closes with 34 pages of news-items, including obituary notices. The paper and printing are of the highest excellence. Let us wish all success to this valuable new venture.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

The first volume of the *Buletinul Institutului de Filologie Română 'Alexandru Philippide'* appeared in 1934. The second (1935) is now to hand, edited, and largely written, by Iorgu Iordan, and published by

the University of Iași. There is no statement as to price. The director's contributions include an 80-page article on mixed conjugations in Rumanian, notes on *barder*, *fleoanca*, *găbji* and *ințesa*, and an essay showing the curiously fluid state of the language in newspapers and even in books. As to the mixed conjugations, they are found in all the dialects, but only in a restricted measure in Istrian and Meglenitic. The former has, generally speaking, limited its changes to accent-shifts. They abound in Macedo-Rumanian and in the Dacian dialects. They do not, therefore, ascend to predialectal Rumanian, but are parallel developments in all dialects, especially favoured where population is densest and intellectual influences most rife. From the late A. Philippide's notes there has been made a collection of references to Rumanian before the sixteenth century. H. Mihaescu's article in Italian 'Latino congetturale, latino volgare' is of wider appeal. He shows the habit of classicizing editors to ignore readings of ancient manuscripts in favour of more modern forms in later manuscripts, or to insert classical forms as conjectural readings. For instance, among attested forms we have *salvaticus*, *salmoria*, *coliandrum*, -em for -im, *acrum acram*, *post* for *postquam*, *ante* for *antea*, numerous compound adverbs, *cinus*, *pulvus*, *triblare*, *cum tortiones*, *quis* for *qui*, etc., for all of which editors have 'conjectured' classical forms. It follows that the Romance linguist dealing with literary evidence must go back to the manuscripts before he can discover their true readings. Gr. Scorpan and G. Ivaescu write on phonetic problems of Rumanian, the former dealing with the value of *ěă* in the sixteenth century (which he concludes must have been *ă*), the latter with Lat. *au*, and medial *ra*, *bl*, *mn*. L. Spitzer considers Rum. *atî(a) amar de vreme* 'ever so long' to be connected with *amar* 'bitter', not *mare* 'sea', and parallel to expressions like 'a terrible time'. P. Ciureana writes on slang in use at Constanța, and Gr. Scorpan on the mixture of literary and dialect forms in the prose of Creangă. There are 44 pages of reviews, among which one notes the praise given to Alf Lombard's recent *Prononciation du roumain*, a veritable *tour de force*, since it was carried out in one month of intensive study.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

A book on Spanish phonetics for English students of the language is certainly welcome. Though Professor Peers and Señorita de Laguna have published handbooks on the subject, there has been no attempt to deal with it in a thoroughly scientific way. Mr F. Stirling (*The Pronunciation of Spanish*. Cambridge Univ. Press. 1935. 88 pp. 4s. 6d.) does not profess to do this, but to help the student in his study of Spanish by reference to English phonetics. He makes some interesting observations with regard to pronunciation, but the main defect of the book is a lack of proportion due to inexperience. The author expects an exact knowledge of English vowel sounds and oversimplifies in his treatment of Spanish vowels. If the book were frankly based on the work of such an investigator as Sr Navarro Tomás, the author's own contributions would show to better advantage.

JANET H. PERRY.

Translation from Spanish, by R. M. Macandrew (London: Black. 1936. 239 pp. 4s. 6d.), is directed to an admitted weakness in our linguistic discipline. Translation is an art, but first it is a science. Precision takes precedence over style. Dr Macandrew accordingly surveys in detail the mechanics of Spanish before developing his principles. Prominent among these are the need for visualization and the suggestive value of classical English literature in the search for the expressive word or phrase. One suspects none the less that his preference is for the exercise as an art, for exactness has taken a very back seat in the confection of the book. We do not refer to proof-reading, though we have noted some scores of misprints, many of them vital (five in one demonstration passage, pp. 121-2). The analysis and discussion of the five specimen passages, of roughly matriculation standard, bristle with inaccuracies, culminating in the first and last in gross errors—'exactly' for 'igualmente' (p. 100), 'in order that this star, for the absence of the sun, might make some slight compensation' for 'Porque sólo este lucero/Supliera del sol la ausencia' (p. 130)—which can be paralleled only too frequently in the grammatical sections. There follow one hundred graded and annotated passages for translation. In the hands of a teacher the book may well prove of considerable utility, though scarcely in the manner intended.

W. C. ATKINSON.

With these three further volumes of the bibliographies of Spanish American literature (*A Bibliography of Rubén Darío, 1867-1916*, by H. Grattan Doyle. Harvard University Press. 1935. vi+28 pp.; *Ensayo de Bibliografía de la Literatura Chilena*, por Arturo Torres-Rioseco y Raúl Silva-Castro. Harvard University Press. 1935. x+71 pp.; *A Tentative Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of the Republics of Central America*, by H. Grattan Doyle. Harvard University Press. 1935. xviii+136 pp.), the task that the Harvard Council of Hispano-American Studies imposed upon itself draws very near to its close, and places all students of Spanish literature still more in its debt. The Rubén Darío volume is specially impressive and likely to be useful, for this author's publications present a sheer chaos to the reader anxious to investigate his work more closely. The other volumes follow the general plan of previous bibliographies. Is not the J. M. Lleras of p. 37 of the Central-American volume the same author that is listed in the Colombian bibliography, p. 39?

E. SARMIENTO.

Hispano-American Literature in the United States. A Bibliography of Translations and Criticism, 1932-34, by S. E. Leavitt (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 21 pp. 50 c.) continues a previous bibliography (Harvard University Press) that dealt with the years up to 1932. It deals with translations, histories and reviews of books.

E. SARMIENTO.

Professor Karl Helm has revised Wilhelm Braune's *Althochdeutsche Grammatik* (Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1936. x+326 pp. 8 M. 50), which now appears in the fifth edition. The plan of the book has remained

unaltered. The change consists mainly in certain additions, viz., there are more references to the other Germanic languages and to Indo-European, more phonetic explanations of sound changes are given, and the work done in Old High German during the last twenty-five years has been noted.

Frequent references are made to Professor Baesecke's grammar and to Dr Brinkmann's *Sprachwandel und Sprachbewegung in althochdeutscher Zeit*. It is a pity that Baesecke's important analysis of *i*-umlaut is not given fully, and that so little use is made of Brinkmann's description of the spread of *i*-umlaut and of the High German consonant shift. This could have been done without increasing the size of the book unduly.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

Albrecht van Borgunnien's Treatise on Medicine, by W. L. Wardale (St Andrews University Publication, No. xxxviii. Published for St Andrews University by Humphrey Milford: Oxford. 1936. xlvii + 80 pp. 10s. 6d.), is an edition of a fifteenth-century Low-German manuscript preserved in the British Museum (Sloane MS., No. 3002). There is little in this text that could be called literature. Much of it concerns the linguist, but primarily it will be of interest to the folklorist and the specialist in medieval medical lore. There are several charms, and it would have been useful had they been singled out for special treatment.

Mr Wardale refers the author, Albrecht van Borgunnien, to Borgoesen near Zonnebeke in Flanders, though he has been unable to gather any biographical information, in spite of wide search. Nor has it proved possible to clear up many of the problems arising out of the relationship and composition of the text. The immediate relation of the text to the Copenhagen and Gotha versions of the *Düdesche Arstedi* is established by many parallels, and the further relationship of the *Düdesche Arstedi* and the *Treatise* to earlier High German versions is made probable by careful comparison with the *Utrechter Arzneibuch*. A full history of the development of the text of these treatises remains to be written. Not that such an investigation is straightforward. Many of these late medieval medical books are nothing but random collections of recipes, and it is doubtful whether it will ever be possible to account for every item in every text. It is to be hoped that Mr Wardale will pursue his inquiries, since he is eminently qualified to deal with this obscure though by no means uninteresting branch of medieval lore.

The Introduction shows some want of editorial technique. Books written in English should banish once and for all the term *umlaut* (*uml.* also occurs!) and, still more, the plural *umlauts*; nor does there seem any need for the constant *vorlage* and *zerdehnt*. And why the persistent use of exclamation-marks, a bad habit invented comparatively recently by writers of German grammatical dissertations? However important an editor may think his text is, he cannot expect a reader to feel startled every time the scribe writes *o* for *u* or *vice versa*. All quotations from the text should have been in italics. The lack of distinction

between quoted form and comment is particularly troublesome in the orthographical analysis. Many of the abbreviations are neither self-evident nor are they explained. Frequently, abbreviations are introduced the meaning of which only becomes clear later. Thus on p. xix we meet 'S', a cryptic reference explained on p. xxii. The same holds true of 'DA', 'KA', 'R', 'Kt', 'U'. 'W' is never explained. It probably means *Wolffenbutteler Arzneibuch*. Does 'Anh.' stand for 'Anhang'? If so, why not say so?

F. NORMAN.

In *Simon Dach, Gedichte*, herausgegeben von Walther Ziesemer (*Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft*, Sonderreihe Band 4. Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. 371 pp. Paper, RM. 12, bound, RM. 14 50), we have the first volume of a complete edition of Simon Dach's works, which will be welcomed by all students of the seventeenth century. Hitherto Dach's poems have been accessible only in incomplete and widely dispersed editions, some of them very rare. The editor of this collection aims at bringing together in four volumes all the authentic writings of Dach.

If the present volume can be taken as an indication of the editor's intentions the complete work will be of great value. It has a good introduction, which includes a short life of Dach and gives an illuminating genealogical table of his relationship to various Königsberg families. This in itself is of great interest because it shows the connexion Dach often had with one or both members of the bridal couple for whom he was commissioned to write one of his many 'Hochzeitgedichte'. The 'Weltliche Lieder' and 'Hochzeitgedichte' follow, as far as possible in chronological order and in Dach's spelling. As the editor points out in his introduction, they should form a valuable basis for the study of genealogy in the city of Königsberg. The multiplicity of families for whom he wrote is indeed bewildering; nor are the poems so devoid of lyrical feeling as the fact that they were written for remuneration might lead us to suspect. There follow useful notes, in which each poem is clearly referred to by number and first line, and two indexes, one of poems, the other of persons.

When this edition is finished, it will show what could be achieved by a frail human being, battling against tremendous odds in the shape of poverty and ill-health on the one hand and a conventional atmosphere on the other. The complete works will not only give us an insight into the mind of one of the greatest poets of the seventeenth century, but will also present a valuable source of information for the Kulturgeschichte of the period.

H. S. M. AMBURGER-STUART.

This selection, *Aus der Gíslasaga*, *Altnordische Übungstexte* No. 7 (edited by Konstantin Reichardt. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1935. viii + 45 pp. 1 M. 70) is taken from the second half of the saga and deals with the period of the hero's outlawry. The last two chapters of the saga are omitted, together with those which deal with the slaying of Þorkell, Gíslí's brother: a synopsis of earlier events is given in the Introduction. The editor's choice serves to emphasize Gíslí's poetic skill: most of his

best verse occurs within the limits chosen, although the interesting Guþrún stanza comes just before the selection begins. The text of the prose is taken from Finnur Jónsson's edition by the same publishers, and follows AM 556 *a*; for the text of the poetry, the editor has departed frequently from Jónsson's more conservative version by incorporating several readings from Arni Magnússon's copy, AM 761 *b*. Footnotes record other important variants and give occasional references to articles on skaldic verse which are mentioned in the Preface. As is usual in this series, there are no notes to the text, but an excellent glossary helps considerably to remedy this deficiency by the translation of difficult phrases and by references to works of authority.

G. N. GARMONSWAY.

In *Old Norse Poems* (Columbia and Oxford University Presses. 1936. xvi+116 pp. 11s. 6d.) Mr Lee M. Hollander has translated with introductions, footnotes, and, where necessary, a certain amount of interpolated commentary some of the most famous and important non-skaldic poems not included in the Poetic *Edda*: that is to say—to use his own titles—The Old Lay of Biarki, The Lay of Ingiald, The Lay of Víkar, Híalmar's Death Song, The Lay of Hervor, The Lay of Hloth and Angantýr, The Lay of Innstein, Hildibrand's Death Song (and Asmund's verses), The Lay of Harold by Thórbjörn hornklofi, The Lay of Eric, The Lay of Hákon by Eyvind Finnsson skáldaspillir, The Song of the Valkyries (Darratharlióth), The Curse of Busla, the half-poetical Oath of Truce, The Riddles of King Heithrek and The Sun Song. The first translation is based on the reconstruction by Axel Olrik, and the second 'leans on' Olrik but eliminates some passages, with artistic and probably scholarly justification. It will be seen that we have here in convenient compass poems of which English versions are either scattered or unobtainable by the readers for whom the book is intended, that is 'the fairly numerous class of those interested in Anglo-Saxon literature, and the specialists in Old Norse not at all'. The translations keep the feeling of the original metres, and Mr Hollander makes no apology for occasional archaisms. There is no need to quarrel with him here over them or over disputed readings and renderings; it is more fitting to express gratitude for a book which will be not only useful to those for whom it is primarily intended, but a valuable and suggestive companion for beginners—and even something more than beginners—in Old Norse studies.

EDITH C. BATHO.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

July—September 1936

With the collaboration of W. G. MOORE (French), MARY S. SERJEANTSON (English), A. T. HATTO and F. NORMAN (German)

GENERAL.

- ANDROVIC, G., *Dizionario delle lingue italiana-slovena*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 40.
Archive d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen-Âge. Paris, Vrin. 40 fr.
BELL, H. I., *The Development of Welsh Poetry*. Oxford Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
BRAMBATI, B., *Arte del leggere*. Rome, Edizioni Roma. L. 22.
BRANDENSTEIN, W., *Die erste 'indogermanische Wanderung' (Klotho, 2)*. Vienna, Gerould. 7 M.
CHADWICK, H. M. and N. K., *The Growth of Literature*, II. Cambridge Univ. Press. 30s.
DE RICCI, S., *Census of Mediaeval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States*, I. New York, H. W. Wilson.
EPPELSHEIMER, H. W., *Handbuch der Weltliteratur*, III. Frankfurt, Klostermann. 3 M.
GOETZ, L. K., *Volkslied und Volksleben der Kroaten und Serben*, I (Slavica, 12). Heidelberg, Winter. 7 M. 50.
HAAG, K., *Werbung für allgemeine Sprachbaulehre*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 1 M. 20.
MONTANARI, F., *Introduzione alla critica letteraria*. Rome, Studium. L. 4.
PERGER, A., *Die Wandlung der dramatischen Auffassung*. Berlin, Elsner. 3 M.
PFEIFFER, J., *Umgang und Dichtung: Einführung in das Verständnis des Dichterischen*. Leipzig, Meiner. 2 M. 50.
PRAMPOLINI, G., *Storia universale della Letteratura*, III, 2: *Letterature di Francia, Germania, Italia, Inghilterra dal romanticismo al 1915; Letteratura nord-americana*. Turin, U.T.E.T. L. 120.
TRUMAN, N., *Historic Costuming*. London, Pitman. 10s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- Kultur der romanischen Völker*, III: W. Mullert, *Frankreich (Schluss)*; H. Gmelin, *Italien (Anfang)*. Potsdam, Athenaion.
STEFFEN, M., *Die Ausdrücke für 'Regen' und 'Schnee' im Französischen, Rotoromanischen und Italienischen*. Diss. Zurich, Leeman.

Medieval Latin.

- CASTRO, A., *Glosarios latino-españoles de la Edad Media (RFE Anejo 22)*. Madrid, Hernando. 25 ptas.

Italian.

- Atti del 3° Congresso regionale di Arti e Tradizioni popolari*. Rome, Ediz. dell' O.N.D. L. 100.
BALDACCHINI, S., *Purismo e romanticismo*, ed. E. Cione. Bari, Laterza. L. 16.
BARBAGALLO, C., *L' Età della Rinascenza e della Riforma*. Turin, U.T.E.T. L. 100.

- BERNARDINO DA SIENA, SAN, *Le Prediche volgari*, ed. P. Bargallini. Milan, Rizzoli. L. 40.
- BUCK, A., *Der Platonismus in den Dichtungen Lorenzo de' Medici's*. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 3 M.
- Canti Carnascialeschi del Rinascimento, ed. C. S. Singleton. Bari, Laterza. L. 40.
- CAPUTO, T. V., *Lo Spirito rinnovatore di Giuseppe Revere*. Trieste, Tip. Giuliana.
- CARDUCCI, G., *Petrarca, Boccaccio e l'Umanesimo* (Ediz. Naz., XI). Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 18.
- COSMO, U., *L'ultima accesa ('Paradiso')*. Bari, Laterza. L. 20.
- FLORA, F., *Il Codice Baruffaldi della Gerusalemme e dell'Aminta di Torquato Tasso*. Milan, Hoepli. L. 20.
- FLORI, E., *Manzoni, Andrea Verga e i Grossi*. Milan, Familia Meneghina. L. 10.
- GOLDONI, C., *Gli Innamorati*, ed. A. Marenduzzo. Milan, Vallardi. L. 2.75.
- GROSSI, T., *Cecco Angiolieri e i Burleschi del 200 e del 300*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- JOSZ, A., *Matteo Maria Boiardo*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- LEOPARDI, *Canti e prose scelte*, ed. S. A. Nulli. Milan, Hoepli. L. 12.50.
- LEOPARDI, *Tutte le poesie*, ed. Mazzoni, 3 vols. Florence, Barbera. L. 18.
- LIPARI, A., *The Dolce Stil Nuovo according to Lorenzo de' Medici*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s.
- LUPPIS, F., *Lodovico Ariosto sul Lago Lemano*. Ferrara, S.A.T.E. Scellini 9.
- MAGGINI, F., *Introduzione allo studio di Dante*. Bari, Laterza. L. 10.
- MANZONI, *Gli Inni sacri*, ed. V. Titone. Palermo, Trimardi. L. 4.
- MANZONI, *I Promessi Sposi*, illust. G. Previati. Milan, Hoepli. L. 10.
- MASCIA, F. S., *Francesco Guicciardini*. Naples, Loffredo. L. 12.
- MASI, C., *Italia e italiani nell'Oriente vicino e lontano (1800-1935)*. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 14.
- NICCOLINI, P., *Ariosto*. Rome, Formiggini. L. 20.
- NICOLETTI, G., *Modernità di Mazzini*. Pisa, Giardini. L. 5.
- NULLI, A., *Francesco Guicciardini*. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 12.
- PACINI, LYDIA, *Petrarca in der deutschen Dichtungslehre vom Barock bis zur Romantik*. Cologne, Petrarca-Haus. 3 M. 60.
- Personaggi dell'inferno dantesco—del purgatorio—del paradiso*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 12.
- POMFILI, L., *Gasparina (Gaspara Stampa)*. Milan, Treves. L. 12.
- RAMOGNINI, G., *Paradiso*. Turin, Tip. Artigianelli. L. 8.
- REICHENBACH, G., *L'Orlando innamorato di M. M. Boiardo*. Florence, La Nuova Italia. L. 15.
- RHO, E., *La Missione teatrale di Carlo Goldoni*. Bari, Laterza. L. 12.
- RIVETTA, P. S., *Avventure e disavventure delle parole*. Milan, Ceschina. L. 10.
- SABA, A., *La Biblioteca di S. Carlo Borromeo*. Florence, Olschki.
- Studi di filologia italiana*, IV (Acc. della Crusca). Florence, Sansoni. L. 30.
- TASSO, T., *Aminta*, ed. G. Previtera. Milan, Vallardi. L. 6.
- TASSO, T., *Rinaldo*, ed. L. Bonfigli. Bari, Laterza. L. 30.
- TITTONI, V., *Giovanni Boccaccio*. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 12.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- Book of Apollonius, The*, trans. by R. L. Grismer and E. Atkins. Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$2.
- BOSCH Y GARCILASO, *Poesías* (facsimile 1543). Madrid, Biblioteca Nueva.
- FRANK, B., *Cervantes: una vita più interessante di un romanzo*. Milan, Bietti.

- GAIBROIS DE BALLESTEROS, M., María de Molina. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 9 ptas.
 HERSCHEL, A., Maimonide. Paris, Payot. 20 fr.
 ISAACS, A. L., The Jews of Majorca. London, Methuen. 8s. 6d.
 JORDER, O., Die Formen des Sonetts bei Lope de Vega (ZRP Beih. 86). Halle, Niemeyer. 22 M.
 MACGILLICUDDY, G. V., Das Meer und das Fischervolk in Pereda's Werken. Diss. Würzburg, Mayr.
 MARAÑÓN, G., El Conde-duque de Olivares. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 25 ptas.
 MONTESINO, Fr. AMBROSIO, Coplas sobre diversas devociones y misterios de nuestra santa fe católica, ed. H. Thomas. Oxford Univ. Press. 25s.
 PEERS, E. A., The Spanish Tragedy. London, Methuen. 10s. 6d.
 ROMAN, El Comendador, Coplas de la Pasión con la Resurrección, ed. H. Thomas. Oxford Univ. Press. 25s.
 SACKHEIM, MUSSIA, Die Lebensphilosophie des Dichters Don Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y Mendoza. Diss. Berlin, Triltsch und Huther.
 TORRES, J. F., La Vida en el Islam español (Leben und Wirken der Romanen). Jena, Gronau. 0 M. 80.
 VOSSLER, K., Poesie der Einsamkeit in Spanien, II (Szb. d. Bayer. Akad.). Munich, Beck. 6 M. 50.

Portuguese.

- CASTANHOSO, História de Dom Christóvam da Gama, ed. A. C. Pires de Lima. Porto, Simões Lopes. 8 esc.
 CIDADE, H., Luis de Camões, I: o lírico (Revista da Faculdade de Letras de Lisboa, III, 1 e 2).
 GALLOP, R., Portugal: a book of folk ways. Cambridge Univ. Press. 15s.

Rumanian, Rhaetoromance.

- DORSCHMER, F., Das Brot und seine Herstellung in Graubünden und Tessin. Diss. Winterthur, Buchdr. Winterthur.
 KELLER, O., Die Mundartwörterbücher und Sprachatlanten der romanischen Schweiz. Solothurn, Vogt-Schild.
 LANSEL, P., Die Rätorumanen, übersetzt von H. Haberlin. Frauenfeld, Huber.

French, Provençal.

(Place of publication is Paris, unless otherwise stated.)

(a) General (including Linguistic).

- ARNAUTOVITCH, A., Le Français, langue internationale. Presses Universitaires. 5 fr.
 ETTMAYER, K., Analytische Syntax der französischen Sprache, II, 10/11 (Schluss). Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.
 Harvard et la France: recueil d'études (Revue d'Histoire moderne). 30 fr.
 HEIDEL, H., Die Terminologie der Finanzverwaltung Frankreichs im 15 Jh. (Leipziger romanist. St., I, 15). Leipzig, Noske. 8 M.
 LANGENHOVE-GIVA, Linguistische Studien, I. Leroux. 30 fr.
 LATOUR, M., 400 Locutions et dictions de nos régions minières de l'Artois, G-P. Maisonneuve. 8 fr.
 MAINONE, F., Formenlehre und Syntax in der Berliner franko-venezianischen Chanson de Geste von 'Huon d'Auvergne' (Leipziger romanist. St., I, 13). Leipzig, Noske. 3 M. 50.
 POPPE, E., Der Wortschatz des Journal du Sieur de Gouberville in seinen Beziehungen zu den heutigen normannischen Mundarten (Leipziger romanist. St., I, 12). Leipzig, Roman. Seminar. 12 M.

- SCHOSSIG, A., Verbum, Aktionsart und Aspekt in der Histoire du Seigneur de Bayart par le loyal serviteur (Beiheft ZRP., 87). Halle, Niemeyer. 14 M.
- SCHULTZ, IRMGARD, Bildhaftigkeit im französischen Argot (Beitr. z. rom. Phil., 27). Giessen, Roman. Seminar. 4 M.
- SOUCHÉ, La Grammaire nouvelle et le français. Nathan. 10 fr. 50.

(b) *Old French.*

- DICKMANN, A., E. Deschamps als Schilderer der Sitten seiner Zeit. Diss. Munster, Poppinghaus.
- GREBAN, A., Le Vray Mistère de la Passion, adaptation. Anciaux. 4 fr.
- HESS, H., Studien zum Mistere du Viel Testament (Frankfurter Quellen, 11) Frankfurt, Diesterweg. 4 M.
- RUGGIERI, R. M., Il Processo di Giano della Chanson de Roland. Florence, Sansoni. L. 12.

(c) *Modern French.*

- AMPÈRE, Correspondance, ed. L. de Launay, I, II. Villars.
- BACH, W., Benjamin Constant und die Politik, 1767-1802. Diss. Leipzig, Vogel.
- BALLAGUY, P., Bayard. Payot. 25 fr.
- BARRÈS, Mes Cahiers, x: 1913-14. Plon. 15 fr.
- BORDEAUX, H., De Baudelaire à Sœur Marguerite. Flammarion. 12 fr.
- CONSTANT, B., Adolphe. Piazza. 40 fr.
- CORDIÈ, C., Sull' Arte della Chartreuse de Parme. Florence, La Nuova Italia. L. 6.
- DAIREAUX, M., Villiers de l'Isle Adam (Temps et Visages). Brouwer. 20 fr.
- DENVEL, R., Apologie de Mort à Crêdit, suivi d'Hommage à Émile Zola par Céline. Denoël et Steelc. 2 fr.
- DERIEUX, H., La Poésie française contemporaine, 1885-1935. Mercure de France. 15 fr.
- DIDEROT, Writings on the Theatre, ed. F. C. Green. Cambridge Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- DUHAMEL, G., Discours de réception à l'Académie française. Réponse de M. Henri Bordeaux. Mercure de France. 10 fr.
- ELFERT, ANNA, Die Dichtung der Louise Labé. Diss. Ahlen, Sommer.
- FIDAO-JUSTINIANI, J. E., Richelieu. Grasset. 20 fr.
- FLAUBERT, Madame Bovary, Salammbô. Fasquelle. 24 fr.
- FLAUBERT, Madame Bovary, ébauches et fragments inédits recueillis par Mlle G. Leleu. Conard. 75 fr.
- FLEURET, F., De Ronsard à Baudelaire. Mercure de France. 15 fr.
- GAMBIER, H., L'Italie et la Renaissance poétique en France. Padua, C.E.D.A.M. L. 25.
- GIDE, Nouvelles pages de journal. NRF. 12 fr.
- GROPPALI, A., La 'Volonté de tous' et la 'volonté générale' nel pensiero di G. G. Rousseau. Milan, Giuffrè. L. 3.
- HAMP, P., L'Œuvre, édition définitive. 5 vols. Gallimard. 15 fr.
- HOLZBECHER, K., Denkart und Denkform von Pierre de Marivaux. Diss. Berlin, Triltsch und Huther.
- JAMMES, F., Dieu, l'âme et le sentiment. NRF. 3 fr.
- JAMMES, F., Le Pèlerin de Lourdes. NRF. 10 fr.
- JOHNSON, M. L., Beaumarchais and his Opponents. Diss. Columbia Univ.
- JULLIAN, C., Lettres de jeunesse: Italie, Allemagne (1880-83). Delmas. 30 fr.
- KAEGI, W., Michelet und Deutschland. Basel, Schwabe.
- KAHN, G., Les Origines du Symbolisme. Messein. 4 fr. 50.

- KUPKA, ILSE, *Italienreisen in der französischen Literatur des 19. Jh.* Breslau, Priebatsch. 4 M.
- LANGWEILER, W., *Hippolyte Taine*. Diss. Heidelberg.
- LEIB, HILDEGARDE, *Les Cas de mésalliances dans le roman et le théâtre français au 18me et 19me siècle*. Diss. Berlin, Ebering. 8 M.
- MABILLE DE PONCHEVILLE, A., *V. Conrart*. *Mercure de France*. 12 fr.
- MADAULE, J., *Le Drame de P. Claudel*. Brouwer. 25 fr.
- MAURER, EVI, *Die Unruhe bei Valéry Larbaud*. Diss. Zurich, Leeman.
- MONCH, W., *Die italienische Platonrenaissance und ihre Bedeutung für Frankreichs Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte (Romanist. St., 40)*. Berlin, Ebering. 16 M.
- NERI, F., *Storia e Poesia ('La sorte del Rotrou')*. Gambino. L. 15.
- PASCAL, *Pensées*. Hyperion. 10 fr.
- PASQUALI, P. S., *Armand Godoy*. Rome, Ediz. Romanes.
- PRADEL, G., *Madame de Sévigné en Provence*. Figuière. 15 fr.
- RAU, E., *Das Périgord und seine Bewohner in den Romanen Eugène Le Roys*. Diss. Emsdetten, Lechte.
- SAND, G., *Mes années d'enfance et d'adolescence*. Gedalge.
- SARDOU, V., *Théâtre complet*, VII. Michel. 20 fr.
- SAUERACKER, JOHANNA, *Bourget und der Naturalismus*. Diss. Breslau, Priebatsch. 3 M. 60.
- SCHLUMBERGER, J., *Plaisir à Corneille: promenade anthologique*. NRF. 32 fr.
- SEYBOLD, BETTY, *Leben und Werke von Marguerite Audoux*. Diss. Würzburg, Mayr.
- STICKELBERGER, E., *Calvin, texte fr. par E. Bienz*. Levrault. 15 fr.
- STREICHER, J., *Commentaire sur les Remarques de Vaugelas par La Mothe le Vayer, etc.* Droz. 60 fr.
- THIBAUDET, *Hommage à Albert Thibaudet*. NRF. 6 fr.
- THIERRY, A., *Lola Montès*. Grasset. 12 fr.
- THOMAS, J., *Sainte-Beuve et l'École Normale, 1834-67*. *Belles Lettres*. 15 fr.
- TIEDTKE, IRMA, *Symbole und Bilder im Werke Marcel Prousts (Stud. z. VKR)*. Hamburg, Evert. 6 M.
- TILLEY, A., *Madame de Sévigné*. Cambridge Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- VALÉRY, *La jeune Parque, commentée par Alain*. Gallimard. 18 fr.
- VALÉRY, *Variétés*, III. Gallimard. 15 fr.
- VASSE, P., *Jules Romains et les médecins: essai sur la genèse de Knock*. Vigo. 15 fr.
- VEDEL, V., *Corneille et son temps; Molière, Fr. transl. Mme E. Cornet (Bibl. RLC 104)*. Champion.
- VINET, A., *Étude sur B. Pascal*, annot. P. Kohler. Fischbacher. 30 fr.

Provençal.

- PESANTE, A., *Federico Mistral e la Pleiade provenzale*. Udine, Ist. delle Ediz. Accademiche. L. 12.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

- HRUBY, A., *Drei Studien zur Technik der islandischen Saga*. Leipzig, Deuticke 0 M. 80.
- HERMANNSSON, H., *The Problem of Wineland (Islandica, xxv)*. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 5s.

English.*(a) General, including Linguistic.*

- BOHM, A., *Entwicklungsgeschichte der englischen Titel und Anreden seit dem 16. Jahrhundert.* Berlin, Brandenburgische Buchdruckerei.
- BRANDL, A., *Forschungen und Charakteristiken.* Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 12 M.
- COWLING, G. H., *The Outline of English Verse.* London, Macmillan. 6s.
- DAICHES, D., *New Literary Values.* Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd. 5s.
- DE RICCI, S., *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada. Vol. I. (American Council of Learned Societies.)* New York, H. W. Wilson.
- Dictionary of American English*, ed. by Sir W. Craigie and J. R. Hulbert. Part I, A-Baggage. Chicago and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s.
- EKWALL, E., *Studies on English Place-Names.* Stockholm, Wahlstrom and Widstrand. 6 kr.
- Englische Kultur in sprachwissenschaftlicher Deutung.* Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 9 M.
- FARRELL, J. T., *A Note on Literary Criticism.* London, Constable. 7s. 6d.
- HATCH, H., *Creating the Modern American Novel.* London, Williams and Norgate. 10s.
- HORT, G., *Sense and Thought.* London, Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.
- MULDER, H., *Cognition and Volition in Language.* Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 2.90 fl.
- NICOLL, A., *Film and Theatre.* London, Harrap. 7s. 6d.
- O'NEILL, E. H., *A History of American Biography, 1800-1935.* Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s.
- RAGLAN, LORD, *The Hero. A Study in Tradition, Myth and Drama.* London, Methuen. 10s. 6d.
- SMITH, L. P., *Reperusals and Recollections.* London, Constable. 12s. 6d.
- SPECKBAUGH, P. F., *Some General Canons of Literary Criticism Determined from an Analysis of Art.* Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America.
- STILL, C., *The Timeless Theme.* London, Nicholson and Watson. 21s.
- Studies in English*, 16. Austin, Univ. of Texas. \$1.00.
- TATE, A., *Reactionary Essays on Poetry and Ideas.* London, Scribners. 7s. 6d.
- TAYLOR, W. F., *A History of American Letters.* New York, American Book Co. \$3.50.
- Year's Work in English Studies*, The, Vol. xv, ed. by F. S. Boas and M. S. Searjeantson. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- ZWIERNER, E. und K., *Grundfragen der Phonometrie.* Berlin, Metten.

(b) Old and Middle English.

- CHAUCER, G., *The Canterbury Tales. A Rendering for Modern Readers*, by F. E. Hill. London, Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.
- KENNEDY, C. W., *Old English Elegies, Translated into Alliterative Verse.* Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s.

(c) Modern English.

- BARNFIELD, R., *Poems.* London, Fortune Press. 15s.
- BRADBROOK, M. C., *The School of Night.* Cambridge Univ. Press. 6s.
- CHAMBERS, Sir E. K., *Sir Henry Lee.* Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15s.
- COLERIDGE, S. T., *Miscellaneous Criticism*, ed. by T. M. Raysor. London, Constable. 24s.

- DAY, J., *The Ile of Guls*, ed. by G. B. Harrison. (Shakespeare Assoc. Facs., 12.) London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 6s.
- EATON, H. A., *Thomas De Quincey*. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 24s.
- FARNHAM, W., *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press. \$5.00.
- FINNEY, C. L., *The Evolution of Keats's Poetry*. 2 vols. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 42s.
- Flomo's First Fruites, ed. by Arundell del Re. 2 vols. Formosa, Taihoku Imperial Univ.
- FLOWER, R., *Laurence Nowell and the Discovery of England in Tudor Times* (Sir I. Gollancz Memorial Lecture, 1935). London, H. Milford, for the British Academy. 2s.
- FORT, J. B., *Samuel Butler (1835-1902)*. Paris, Didier. 50 fr. and 15 fr.
- GALINSKY, H., *Die Familie im Drama von Thomas Heywood* (Spr. u. Kultur der germ. u. rom. Völker, A. xxii). Breslau, Priebatsch. 4 M.
- GAPP, S. V., *George Gissing Classicist*. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s.
- GREEN, M., *The Spleen*, ed. by W. H. Williams. London, Methuen. 3s. 6d.
- GUPTA, S. C. S., *The Art of Bernard Shaw*. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- HEIL, L., *Die Darstellung der englischen Tragödie zur Zeit Bettertons*. Düsseldorf, G. H. Nolte.
- If you Know not Me, you Know Nobody*, 1 and 2, ed. by Madeleine Doran and W. W. Greg (Malone Soc. Reprint). 2 vols. Oxford Univ. Press.
- John of Bordeaux*, ed. by W. L. Renwick and W. W. Greg (Malone Soc. Reprint). Oxford Univ. Press.
- JONSON, B., *Poems*, ed. by B. H. Newdigate. Oxford, Blackwell. 31s. 6d.
- LANDOR, W. S., *Complete Works*, ed. by S. Wheeler. Vol. xvi. *Poems iv*. London, Chapman and Hall. 30s.
- LOCKE, J., *An Early Draft of his Essay, together with Excerpts from his Journals*, ed. by R. I. Aaron and J. Gibb. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.
- LUCAS, F. L., *The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal*. Cambridge Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- MARK, H., *Die Verwendung der Mundart und des Slang in den Werken von John Galsworthy* (Spr. u. Kultur der germ. u. rom. Völker, A. xxiii). Breslau, Priebatsch. 5 M.
- MOORE, V., *The Life and Eager Death of Emily Brontë*. London, Rich and Cowan. 18s.
- MOORE SMITH, G. C., *The Family of Withypoll*. Revised by P. H. Reaney. Walthamstow Antiquarian Society. 12s. 6d.
- MORRIS, M., *William Morris*. Oxford, Blackwell. 52s. 6d.
- MUGGERIDGE, M., *The Earnest Atheist. A Study of Samuel Butler*. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode. 10s. 6d.
- MUTSCHMANN, H., *Milton's Projected Epic on the Rise and Future Greatness of the Britannic Nation*. Tartu, Krüger. 6s. 8d.
- PAIN, P., *Daily Meditations*. Facsimile Reprint, with Introduction by L. Howard. San Marino, Huntington Library. 75 c.
- PARRISH, M. L., *Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes. First Editions in the Library at Dormy House*. London, Constable. 42s.
- PEARSON, H., *The Swan of Lichfield*. London, H. Hamilton. 12s. 6d.
- RAVEN, A. A., *A 'Hamlet' Bibliography and Reference Guide, 1877-1935*. Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 16s.

- Representative English Comedies. Vol. iv. Dryden and his Contemporaries. Ed. by C. M. Gayley and Alwin Thaler. New York, Macmillan. 15s.
- RIDLEY, M. R., William Shakespeare: A Commentary. London, Dent. 2s.
- RUTHERFORD, M., Autobiography. Mark Rutherford's Deliverance. The Revolution in Tanner's Lane. Ed. by R. Shapcott. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 3s. 6d. each.
- SACHS, W., Der typisch puritanische Ideengehalt in Bunyans 'Life and Death of Mr Badman'. Zwonitz 1. Erzgeb., Ott.
- SANTAYANA, G., Obiter Scripta, ed. by J. Buchler and B. Schwartz. London, Constable. 10s.
- SEILLIÈRE, E., David Herbert Lawrence et les récentes idéologies allemandes. Paris, Boivin. 15 fr.
- SNYDER, F. B., Robert Burns. Toronto and Oxford Univ. Presses. 6s. 6d.
- Soddered Citizen, The, ed. by J. H. P. Pafford and W. W. Greg (Malone Soc. Reprint). Oxford Univ. Press.
- STAMM, R., Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes. Zurich und Leipzig, Niehan. 12.70 M.
- STEVENSON, L., The Wild Irish Girl. The Life of Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan. London, Chapman and Hall. 15s.
- STREETER, H. W., The Eighteenth-Century English Novel in French Translation. New York, Inst. of French Studies. \$2.25.
- Trial and Flagellation, The, with other Studies in the Chester Cycle, ed. by F. M. Salter and W. W. Greg (Malone Soc. Reprint). Oxford Univ. Press.
- VAN DER VAT, D. G., The Fabulous Opera. A Study in Continuity in French and English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century. Groningen, J. B. Wolters.
- UDALL, N., Roister Doister, ed. by W. W. Greg (Malone Soc. Reprint). Oxford Univ. Press.
- View of France, The, 1604, ed. by W. P. Barrett (Shakespeare Assoc. Facs., 13). London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- VINCENT, E. R., Gabriele Rossetti in England (Oxford Stud. in Mod. Lang. and Lit.). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12s. 6d.
- WILD, J., George Berkeley. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 25s.
- WILLIAMS, B. C., George Eliot. London, Macmillan. 17s.
- WORDSWORTH, D., George and Sarah Green, ed. by E. de Selincourt. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5s.
- Work for Chimney-Sweepers, ed. by S. H. Atkins (Shakespeare Assoc. Facs., 11). London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 6s.

German.

(a) General, including Linguistic.

- ANTON, R., Falsches, Unsinniges, Geschmackloses in der heutigen deutschen Schrift- und Vortragssprache. Leipzig, Beyer. 0 M. 40.
- BADENHAUSEN, R., Das spanische Kostüm und seine Bedeutung für die Bühne. Kallmünz, Lassleben.
- BAUM, E., Bismarcks Urteil über England und die Engländer. München, Beck.
- BLEYER, F., Beiträge zur Dialektgeographie des südwestl. Westerwaldes. Bonn, Scheur.
- BRANDENSTEIN, W., Die erste 'indogermanische' Wanderung (Klotho, Bd. 2). Wien, Gerold und Co. 7 M.
- BUNNING, H., Studien zur Geschichte der Bremischen Mundart. Hamburg, Wachholtz.

- Cercle linguistique de Prague, Travaux du, Nr. 6 (Études dédiées au 4^e congrès de linguistes pragues 1936). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 9 M.
- DORSCHNER, F., Das Brot und seine Herstellung in Graubünden und Tessin. Ein Beitrag zur Wort- und Sachforschung. Winterthur, Buchdruckerei Winterthur.
- EMMEL, H., Masken in volkstümlichen deutschen Spielen (Deutsche Arbeiten der Universität Koln, Bd. 10). Jena, Diederichs. 5 M.
- ERICH, O., und BEITL, R., Wörterbuch der deutschen Volkskunde (Kröners Taschenausgabe, Bd. 127/128). 6 M. 50.
- FEIST, S., Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache mit Einschluss des Krimgotischen und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen (3. neubearb. und vermehrte Auflage). Leiden, Brill. 3 Fl.
- FUNCK, B., Papiersprache oder lebendiges Deutsch. Grundsätzliches zur Spracherneuerung. Leipzig, Ernst. 0 M. 60.
- GOLDMANN, E., Neue Beiträge zur Lehre vom indogermanischen Charakter der etruskischen Sprache (Klotho, Bd. 3). Wien, Gerold. 28 M.
- GRUND, H., Die Mundart von Pfungstadt und ihre sprachliche Schichtung (Bausteine zur Volkskunde und Religionswissenschaft, H. 13). Buhl, Konkordia. 3 M. 50.
- GUNNARSSON, G., Island, die Saga-Insel. Übers. von H. de Boor. Berlin, Limpert. 3 M.
- GUTENBRUNNER, S., Die germanischen Götternamen der antiken Inschriften (Rheinische Beiträge und Hilfsbücher zur germ. Philologie und Volkskunde, Bd. 24). Halle, Niemeyer. 12 M.
- HAAG, K., Werbung für die allgemeine Sprachbaulehre. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 1 M. 20.
- Heidelberg, Die Universität. Ein Wegweiser durch ihre wissenschaftlichen Anstalten, Institute und Kliniken. Hrsg. von der Pressestelle der Universität. Heidelberg, Heidelberger Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei. 1 M. 50.
- HEILFURTH, G., Das Erzgebirgische Bergmannshed. Ein Aufriss seiner Literaturgeschichte. Schwarzenberg, Glückauf-Verlag. 7 M. 50.
- HENSCHKE, K., Pommersche Sagengestalten (Pommernforschung, Reihe 2, H. 2). Greifswald, Bamberg. 2 M. 40.
- HERING, W., Die Mundart von Bozel (Savoyen). Borna, Leipzig.
- Indogermanisches Jahrbuch. Hrsg. von A. Delbrunner und W. Porzig. Bd. 20 = Jahrgang 1936. Berlin, de Gruyter. 28 M.
- Internationale Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur mit Einschluss von Sammelwerken und Zeitungen, Abt. A, Bibliographie der deutschen Zeitschriftenliteratur, Bd. 77 (Juli-Dezember 1935). Markkleeberg, Dietrich. 136 M. 70.
- Internationale Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur, Abt. C, Bibliographie der Rezensionen, Bd. 60, 1935. Markkleeberg, Dietrich. 150 M. 20.
- Jahrbuch der deutschen Bibliotheken, Jahrgang 26/27. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 10 M.
- Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der german. Philologie, Neue Folge, Bd. 13 = Jahrgang 54. Berlin, de Gruyter. 17 M.
- Jahresbericht über die wiss. Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur, Neue Folge, Bd. 13. Bibliographie 1933. Berlin, de Gruyter. 17 M.
- JOACHIM, J., Die Anfänge der Königlichen Sozietät der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse, Folge 3, Nr. 19). Berlin, Weidmann. 7 M.

- JOLLES, M., Das deutsche Nationalbewusstsein im Zeitalter Napoleons. Frankfurt a.M., Klostermann. 8 M. 50.
- KIPARSKY, V., Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen. Helsinki, Finnische Literaturgesellschaft.
- KLAUS, W., Namen und Lage der Fluren der Gemarkung Schwerte. Schwerte, Braus. 0 M. 25.
- KLUGE, O., Erasmus damals und heute. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 1 M.
- KROGMANN, W., Deutsch. Eine wortgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Deutsche Wortforschung, Heft 1). Berlin, de Gruyter. 6 M.
- LEHMANN, E., Einführung in die Zeitschriftenkunde. Leipzig, Hiersemann. 12 M.
- LEHMANN, E., Zeitschriftenkunde im Dienst der Wissenschaft und Praxis. Berlin, Lorentz. 0 M. 80.
- LEYEN, FR. VON DER, Deutsche Dichtung und deutsches Wesen (Neue Auflage). Köln, Schaffstein. 0 M. 40.
- LUTHER, A., Deutsches Land in deutscher Erzählung. Ein literarisches Ortslexikon. Leipzig, Hiersemann. 24 M.
- MOSER, G., Studien zur Dialektgeographie des Staudengebietes und des anstossenden Lechrains (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, H. 32). Marburg, Elwert. 5 M.
- NEUBERT, H., Zur Geschichte der Sächsischen Landesbibliothek. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 3 M.
- POKORNY, J., Substrattheorie und Urheimat der Indogermanen. Wien, Anthropol. Gesellschaft. 1 M. 20.
- SCHINDLMAYR, H., Mittelschwabischer Volksspiegel. 2000 Sprichwörter und Redensarten in schwäbischer Mundart. Augsburg, Bayrisches Schulmuseum. 1 M. 80.
- SCHMIDT, WILLIBALD, Sagen aus dem Isarwinkel. Bad Tölz, Dewitz. 2 M. 20.
- SCHMITT, L., Die deutsche Urkundensprache in der Kanzlei Kaiser Karls IV [1346-1378] (Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung, Beih. 15). Halle, Niemeyer. 11 M.
- SCHOPPMANN, H., Die Flurnamen des Kreises Soest, Teil 1 (Zeitschrift des Vereins für die Geschichte von Soest und der Börde, H. 52). Soest, Rocholsche Buchdruckerei. 4 M.
- SCHREIBER, H., Nachklänge zu Friedrich Adolf Eberts Lehrbuch der Bibliographie. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 2 M.
- SCHUCHHARDT, C., Der germanische Mantel und das illyrische Röckchen (offprint from: Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1936, 15). Berlin, de Gruyter. 1 M. 50.
- SEILER, H., Die Masse bei Tacitus. Erlangen, Palme und Enke. 3 M.
- STÖTZEL, H., Die deutsche Bergmannssage. Essen, Backmeisters Nationalverlag. 2 M.
- STURMFELS, W., Die Ortsnamen Hessens. Etymolog. Wörterbuch der Orts-, Berg- und Flussnamen des Volksstaates Hessen (3. Auflage). Giessen, Roth. 2 M. 80.
- Volkmärchen, Die romantisch-komischen. Hrsg. von Otto Rommel (Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, Reihe: Barock, Bd. 2). Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- WALLNER, E., Die Herkunft der Nordsiebenbürger Deutschen im Lichte der Flurnamengeographie. Würzburg, Mayr.

(b) *Old Saxon and Low German.*

No entries.

(c) *Old and Middle High German.*

- BETZ, W., Der Einfluss des Lateinischen auf den althochdeutschen Sprachschatz, 1. Abrogans (Germanische Bibliothek, Abt. 2, Bd. 40). Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M.
- BONMANN, O., Ein Franziskanischer Literarkatalog des 15. Jahrhunderts. Werl, Franziskus-Druckerei. 1 M.
- CARTELLIERI, A., Der Aufstieg des Papsttums im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte 1047-1095. Munchen, Oldenbourg. 15 M.
- Christi Leiden. In einer Vision geschaut. Hrsg. von R. Priebsch. (Germanische Bibliothek, Abt. 2, Bd. 39.) Heidelberg, Winter. 3 M. 50.
- Chronica Mathiae de Nuwenburg (Monumenta Germaniae historica. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, Nova series, T. 4, fasc. 2). Berlin, Weidmann. 12 M. 80.
- Deutsche Chroniken. Hrsg. H. Maschek. (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe: Realistik des Spätmittelalters, Bd. 5.) Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- GROSSE, W., Aus der Frühgeschichte der Grafschaft Wernigerode: Vom Ursprung des ersten Grafen von Wernigerode (Schriften des Wernigeroder Geschichtsvereins, H. 17). Wernigerode am Harz, Druckerei und Kartonagenwerk. 0 M. 50.
- Grundung des christlich-deutschen Konigtums und christlich-deutscher Kultur zur Zeit der Sachsenkaiser, Die. Hrsg. H. Raskop. (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für neuzeitliche Volksbildungsarbeit.) Mainz, Matthias-Grunewald-Verlag. 4 M. 20.
- HESE, E., Die Jagd Hadamars von Laber. Beiträge zu ihrer Erklärung. (Deutschkundliche Arbeiten A, Bd. 3.) Breslau, Maruschke und Berendt. 4 M. 75.
- LUGINBUEHL, E., Die altdutsche Kirchensprache (Programm der St Gallischen Kantonsschule und der Sekundarschule des Kantons St Gallen, 80). St Gallen, Weiss. 2 Fr. 50.
- MACCOBB, A., The double preterite forms gie-gienc, lie-liez, vie-vienc in Middle High German (Hesperia, No. 11). Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 3 M.
- MEDERER, E., Die Alexanderlegenden bei den ältesten Alexanderhistorikern (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft, H. 8). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 7 M. 50.
- MERGELL, B., Wolfram von Eschenbach und seine französischen Quellen. 1. Wolframs Willehalm. (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, H. 6.) Münster, Aschendorff. 6 M. 25.
- NAUMANN, H., und WEYDT, G., Herbst des Minnesangs (Literarhistorische Bibliothek, Bd. 17). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 4 M. 80.
- ROTHENFELDER, L., Namenverzeichnis zu drei Nürnberger Wappen- und Geschlechterbüchern des Germanischen Nationalmuseums. Nürnberg, Ges. der Familienkunde in Franken.
- SCHURENBERG, W., Apollonius von Tyrland. Fabulistik und Stilwille bei Heinrich von Neustadt. Berlin, Preuss. Druckerei und Verlag Ges.
- SWARZENSKI, O., Die lateinischen illuminierten Handschriften des 13. Jahrhunderts in den Ländern an Rhein, Main und Donau (Denkmaler deutscher Kunst). Berlin, Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft. 88 M.
- Urkunden der deutschen Karolinger, Die (Monumenta Germaniae historica. Diplomata regum Germaniae ex stirpe Karolnorum, T. 2, Fasc. 1). Bearbeitet von P. Kehrer. Berlin, Weidmann. 35 M.
- WEHowsKY, G., Schmuckformen und Formbruch in der deutschen Reimpaardichtung des Mittelalters. Breslau, Plischke.

(d) *Early New High German.*

- BECKER, A., Hutten-Sickingen im Zeitenwandel (Beiträge zur Heimatkunde der Pfalz, Nr. 16).
- BENARY, E., Liedformen der deutschen Mystik im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. Greifswald, Adler.
- BENZING, J., Der Buchdruck des 16. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet (Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, Beih. 68). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 8 M.
- HELLWEG, G., Nikolaus Gryses Schriften als Quelle für Volksglauben und Sitte des 16. Jahrhunderts. Teildr. Hamburg.
- HOFFMANN, A., Untersuchungen zu den altdeutschen Marco Polo-Texten (Freiburger Forschungen zur Kunst- und Literaturgeschichte, H. 4). Ohlau, Eschenhagen. 6 M.
- KRUEGER, G., Hans Lufft und die Anfänge des Wittenberger Buchdrucks. Wittenberg, Tietze. 0 M. 60.
- LERCHE, H., Studien zu den deutsch-evang. Psalmenübersetzungen des 16. Jahrhunderts. Ohlau, Mayr.
- MORSBACH, C., Jakob Bidermanns 'Philemon Martyr' nach Bau und Gehalt. Bottrop i. W., Postberg.
- MUNCH, J., Die sozialen Anschauungen des Hans Sachs in seinen Fastnachtspielen. Erlangen, Krahle.
- NOLL, H., Der Typus des relig. Grammatikers im 16. Jahrhundert, dargestellt an Valentin Ickelsamer. Gelnhausen, Kalbfleisch.
- RAILLARD, R., Pamphilus Gengenbach und die Reformation. Heidelberg, Evang. Verlag.
- ROHR, H., Ulrich von Hutten und das Werden des deutschen Nationalbewusstseins. Hamburg, Evert.
- WAETZOLDT, W., Dürers Ritter, Tod und Teufel (Preussische Jahrbücher, Schriftenreihe, Nr. 33). Berlin, Stilke. 1 M. 20.
- WIESSNER, E., Kommentar zu Heinrich Wittenwilers Ring (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe: Realistik des Spätmittelalters, Erg. Bd.). Leipzig, Reclam. 2 M. 40.

(e) *Modern German.*

- BALET, L., Die Verbürgerlichung der deutschen Kunst, Literatur und Musik im 18. Jahrhundert (Sammlung musikwiss. Abhandlungen, Bd. 18). Strassburg, Leipzig, Zürich, Heitz und Co.; Leiden, J. Ginsberg. 12 M. 50.
- BARING, N., Wilhelm Diltheys Philosophie der Geschichte. Bückeburg, Prinz.
- BAUMANN, G., Jüdische und völkische Literaturwissenschaft. Ein Vergleich zwischen Eduard Engel und Adolf Bartels. München, Eher. 1 M. 20.
- BECK, A., und ZILCHERT, R., Goethe und der Olympische Gedanke. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 3 M. 50.
- BERGMANN, A., Christ. Dietr. Grabbe 1801-1836. Sein Leben in Bildern. (Meyers Bild-Bändchen, Nr. 23.) Leipzig, Bibliograph. Institut. 0 M. 90.
- BLEICH, E., Der Bote aus der Fremde als formbedingender Kompositionsfaktor im Drama des deutschen Naturalismus. Berlin, Tritsch und Huther.
- BLINKINSOP, E., Bürger's Originality. Oxford, Blackwell. 4s. 6d.
- BRADISH, J. von, Goethes Beamtenlaufbahn (Veröffentlichungen des Verbandes deutscher Schriftsteller und Literaturfreunde in New York, Wiss. Reihe, H. 4). New York, Berlin, Westermann. 6 M. 75.
- BRUFORD, W., Die gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen der Goethezeit (Literatur und Leben, Bd. 9). Weimar, Böhlau. 8 M. 50.

- BURGER, H., Von Wesen und Ursprung der neueren deutschen Lyrik (Schriften und Vorträge der württemberg. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Geisteswiss. Abt., H. 2). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 1 M. 20.
- CLEFF, E., Grundzüge deutschen Wesens in der Dichtung Rainer Maria Rilkes. Würzburg, Triltsch. 2 M. 50.
- COLMI, E., Wandlungen in der Auffassung von Jakob Burckhardt. Emsdetten, Lechte. 3 M.
- CYSARZ, H., Vom Dichter- und Meistertum Friedrich Schillers (Deutsche Blätter, Nr. 21). Langensalza, Beltz. 0 M. 15.
- CZIBULKA, A. von, Das Volksbuch vom Prinzen Eugen. München, Hugendubel. 4 M. 80.
- DEMPP, A., Görres spricht zu unserer Zeit (2. Auflage). Freiburg, Herder. 2 M. 50.
- DETJEN, H., Hermann Bossdorf als Dramatiker. Hamburg, Propper.
- Deutschland und die Schweiz in ihren kulturellen und politischen Beziehungen während der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Hrsg. von W. Naf. (Berner Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Geschichte, H. 9.) Bern, Lang. 7 Fr. 50.
- DIECKMANN, K., 'Die Braut von Messina' auf der Bühne im Wandel der Zeit. Helsingfors, Centraltryckeriet.
- Dramen der Frühromantik. Hrsg. von P. Kluckhohn. (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe: Romantik, Bd. 8.) Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- DÜRLER, J., Die Bedeutung des Bergbaus bei Goethe und in der deutschen Romantik (Wege zur Dichtung, Bd. 24). Frauenfeld, Leipzig. 7 M. 20.
- DUWE, W., Die dramatische Form Wedekinds in ihrem Verhältnis zur Ausdruckskunst. München, Huber.
- EBING, H. A., Die deutsche Kurzgeschichte. Bochum, Poppinghaus.
- Empfindsamkeit, Sturm und Drang. Hrsg. von M. Beyer. (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe: Deutsche Selbstzeugnisse, Bd. 9.) Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- EPHRAIM, C., Wandel des Griechenbildes im 18. Jahrhundert (Sprache und Dichtung, H. 61). Bern, Haupt. 4 M. 80.
- FABER, G., Carl Bleibtreu als Literaturkritiker. Berlin, Ebering.
- FREMGEN, L., Metaphysik der Liebe. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Schopenhauer. Eisfeld i. Thür., Beck.
- GALLI, H., Richard Wagner und die deutsche Klassik. Bern, Haupt. 2 M. 40.
- Goethe: Briefe an Frau von Stein, nebst dem Tagebuch aus Italien und Briefen der Frau von Stein. Vorwort von Wilhelm von Scholz. Berlin, Deutsche-Buch-Gemeinschaft. 9 M. 40.
- GRÄF, H., Goethes Ehe in Briefen. (Ungekürzte Ausgabe.) Potsdam, Rütten und Loening. 8 M.
- GRAUOB, K., Kindliches und jugendliches Seelenleben in deutscher Dichtung (Akademie gemeinnütziger Wissenschaften zu Erfurt, Abt. für Erziehungswiss. und Jugendkunde, Veröffentlichungen, Nr. 36). Erfurt, Stenger. 3 M.
- GRÜTZMACHER, R., Goethes Faust. Ein deutscher Mythos, Teile 1, 2. (Preussische Jahrbücher, Schriftreihe, Nr. 34, 35.) Berlin, Stilke. 3 M. 50 (each).
- HAEUPTNER, G., Die Geschichtsansicht des jungen Nietzsche. Versuch eine immanenten Kritik der zweiten unzeitgemässen Betrachtung: 'Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben.' (Geisteswiss. Forschungen, H. 9.) Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 12 M.
- HEIDEMANN, G., Konrad Telmann. Ein Lebensbild des Dichters aus seinem lyrischen Schaffen. (Pommernforschungen, Reihe 3, H. 3.) Greifswald, Bamberg. 3 M. 30.

- HEINEKAMP, H., Das Weltbild J. G. Hamanns. Dusseldorf, Nolte.
- HELD, M., Freundschaft in der Freiheit. Entstehungsgeschichte des 'Fahnleins der sieben Aufrechten'. Zurich, Held.
- HEYD, G., Ein Wortweiser im Faustwerk (Die Goethe Bucher, Nr. 3). Hamburg, Heyd. 2 M. 60.
- HUEZ, T., Gottlieb Conrad Pfeffel und seine Beziehungen zur Schweiz. Auf Grund der im Basler Sarasin-Archiv erhaltenen Korrespondenz. Colmar, Selbstverlag des 'Colmarer Jahrbuchs'. 25 Fr.
- HUSEMANN, F., Goethe und die Heilkunst. Dresden, Weise. 3 M. 60.
- Jahresbericht der Gorres-Gesellschaft, 1936. Erstattet von A. Allgeier. Köln, Bachem. 1 M. 60.
- Jahresbericht der Gottfried-Keller-Gesellschaft. Zurich, Gottfried-Keller-Gesellschaft.
- Jahresbericht des Justinus Kerner-Vereins Weinsberg...und des demselben angeghederten Frauenvereins Weinsberg. Fur das Jahr 1935. Weinsberg, Justinus Kerner-Verein.
- JANSEN, L., Karoline Pilchers Schaffen und Weltanschauung im Rahmen ihrer Zeit (Deutsche Quellen und Studien, Bd. 13). Graz, Wachter-Verlag. 16 M.
- Jean-Paul-Blätter, Jahrgang 11.
- JERSCHKE, I., Wolfgang Helmhard Freiherr von Hohberg, ein Dichter aus der Zeit des Barock. Emsdetten, Lechte.
- KELLER, M., Der deutsche Expressionismus im Drama seiner Hauptvertreter. Weimar, Böhlau. 3 M.
- KIND, H., Das Kind in der Ideologie und der Dichtung der Romantik. Dresden, Dittert.
- KOPLOWITZ, O., Otto Brahm als Theaterkritiker. Mit Bruchstücken seiner literarhist. Arbeiten. (Basler Beitrage zur deutschen Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte, Bd. 3.) Zurich, Niehans. 6 M. 70.
- KUTZBACH, K., Paul Ernsts Lustspiel 'Liebe aus Eifersucht' oder 'Der Gärtnerhund'. Chemnitz, Adam.
- LABUS, L., 'Minna von Barnhelm' auf der deutschen Bühne. Berlin, Levy.
- LEONHARDT, E., Die mysteriöse Ballade in ihren Anfängen (18. Jh.). Bochum, Pöppinghaus.
- LIEBMANN, K., Das dichterische Lebenswerk von Friedrich Kurt Benndorf. Dresden, Jess. 1 M.
- LORENZEN, H., Typen deutscher Anekdotenerzählung (Kleist-Hebel-Schäfer). Bochum, Pöppinghaus.
- LUCAS, W., Die epischen Dichtungen Shakespeares in Deutschland. Philippsburg, Kruse.
- LUGOWSKI, C., Wirklichkeit und Dichtung. Untersuchungen zur Wirklichkeitsauffassung Heinrich von Kleists. Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 6 M.
- MARX, R., Zinzendorf und seine Lieder (Welt des Gesangbuchs, Nr. 11). Leipzig, Schloessmann. 1 M. 40.
- MEINHOLD, P., Rousseaus Geschichtsphilosophie (Philosophie und Geschichte, Bd. 60). Tübingen, Mohr. 1 M 20.
- MELCHER, K., Friedrich Griese (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Bd. 78). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 6 M. 50.
- MENG, H., Schillers Abhandlung über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung. Frauenfeld, Leipzig.
- MEYER, P., Stifters Verhältnis zur Lyrik. Limburg, Vereinsdruckerei.

- MICHEL, J., Goethes Werther. Beiträge zum Formenproblem des jungen Goethe. Kiel und Leipzig, Lipsius und Tischer. 1 M. 80.
- MINDER, R., Die religiöse Entwicklung von Karl Philipp Moritz auf Grund seiner autobiographischen Schriften. Studien zum 'Reiser' und 'Hartknopf'. (Neue Forschungen, Bd. 28.) Berlin, Junker und Dohnhaupt. 11 M.
- MISES, R. von, Bericht von einer Rilke-Sammlung. Wien, Reichner.
- Mittelungen für die Gesellschaft der Freunde Wilhelm Raabes, Jahrgang 26.
- MOST, R., Schillers Mittelalterauffassung (Münstersche Beiträge zur Geschichtsforschung, Folge 3, H. 11). Münster, Univ. Buchhandlung Cöppenrath. 3 M.
- MÜLLER, H., Die Hauptvertreter des deutschen Geisteslebens von der Mitte des 18. bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts im Spiegel der schwedischen Presse. Leipzig, Lange.
- MÜLLER-SCHONAU, H., Sportsmann Goethe. Berlin, Teubner. 2 M.
- MUMBAUER, J., Die deutsche Dichtung der neuesten Zeit, Bd. 1. Freiburg, Herder. 8 M.
- Nietzsche, F., Also sprach Zarathustra. Hrsg. von W. Linden. Berlin, Deutsches Verlagshaus Bong. 1 M. 90.
- Nietzsche, F., Jenseits von Gut und Böse. Zur Genealogie der Moral. Götzendämmerung (Teils). Hrsg. von W. Linden. Berlin, Deutsches Verlagshaus Bong. 1 M. 90.
- OEHRENS, W. Über einige ästhetische Grundbegriffe bei Karl Philipp Moritz. Hamburg, Christians.
- ORTEL, K., 'Proximus und Lycopida'. Eine Studie zum idealistischen Roman Grimmlshausens. (Germanische Studien, H. 177.) Berlin, Ebering. 6 M.
- OTTO, W., Der junge Nietzsche (Wissenschaft und Gegenwart, Nr. 10). Frankfurt a.M., Klostermann. 1 M. 75.
- PACINI, L., Petrarca in der deutschen Dichtungslehre vom Barock bis zur Romantik (Italische Studien, 1). Köln, Petrarca-Haus. 3 M. 60.
- PERGER, A., Die Wandlung der dramatischen Auffassung. Berlin, Elsner Verlagsgesellschaft. 3 M.
- PERL, W., Das lyrische Jugendwerk Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Berlin, Ebering.
- Platens, Dem Andenken. Hrsg. vom deutschen Seminar an der Peking Reichsuniversität. Tientsin-Peiping, Peiyang Press. 2 M.
- PLAUT, R., Arthur Schnitzler als Erzähler. Frankfurt a.M., Kornsand.
- PORSCHKE, K., Die Vergestalt in Holderlins Elegienzyklus 'Menons Klagen um Diotima' mit einer Untersuchung über Aufgabe und Methode wiss. Versbetrachtung. Kiel, Ehlers.
- Raimund-Almanach. Hrsg. von O. Zausmer. Wien, Tyrolia. 2 M. 50.
- RASCH, W., Freundschaftskult und Freundschaftsdichtung im deutschen Schrifttum des 18. Jahrhunderts vom Ausgang des Barock bis zu Klopstock (Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwiss. und Geistesgeschichte, Buchreihe, Bd. 21). Halle, Niemeyer. 11 M.
- RASSY, G., Walter von Moles. Ein Dichter des deutschen Menschen. Leipzig, Bohn. 2 M.
- RAUSCHER, O., Ferdinand Raimund, 1790-1836. Sein Leben in Bildern. (Meyers Bildbandchen, 22.) Leipzig, Bibliograph. Institut. 0 M. 90.
- REDENBACHER, F., Platenbibliographie. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek. 6 M.
- RIECKE, H., Wesen und Macht des Heldischen in Ernst Jungers Kriegsdichtungen. Hamburg, Niemann und Moschinski.
- SACK, A., Burtes 'Wiltfeber', der heimatlose deutsche 'Zwischenmensch' um die Wende des 19. Jahrhunderts. Bochum, Pöppinghaus.

- SCHERING, A., Beethoven und die Dichtung (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Musikwissenschaft, Bd. 3). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 16 M.
- SCHLOMER, H., Gottfried Kellers politische Anschauungen. Heidelberg, Fahrner.
- SCHNEIDER, F., Christian Reuter (Hallische Universitätsreden, Nr. 69). Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 20.
- SCHNEIDER, H., Wilhelm Raabes Mittel der epischen Darstellung (Germanische Studien, H. 178). Berlin, Ebering. 8 M. 40.
- SCHROEDER, S., Amerika in der deutschen Dichtung von 1850–1890. Wertheim a.M., Bechstein.
- Stifter, Adelbert, Briefe. Tübingen, Wunderlich. 5 M. 50.
- STOECKLEIN, G., Romantik in Wesen und Prosadramen Gerhart Hauptmanns. Tübingen, Laupp.
- STOLTE, H., Der Volksschriftsteller Karl May. Radebeul, Karl-May-Verlag. 1 M. 60.
- TAUBE, G., Die Rolle der Natur in Gerhart Hauptmanns Gegenwartswerken bis zum Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts (Germanische Studien, H. 176). Berlin, Ebering. 5 M.
- VORBACH, B., Adelbert Stifter und die Frau. Reichenberg, Kraus. 4 M.
- Wagner, R., An Mathilde und Otto Wesendonk. Tagbuchblätter und Briefe. (Die Schatzkammer, Nr. 125.) Hrsg. von J. Kappe. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker Verlag. 2 M. 85.
- Wagner, Richard, Die Briefe an Judith Gautier. Hrsg. von Willi Schuh. Erlenbach-Zürich, Rotapfel-Verlag. 4 M.
- Wagner, R., Leben und Werke in urkundlichen Zeugnissen, Briefen, Schriften, Berichten. Hrsg. von W. Golther. (Die Bücher der Rosc.) Evenhausen, Langewiesche-Brandt. 3 M. 60.
- WEISSEDER, K., Goethes 'Faust' und das Christentum (Studien und Bibliographie zur Gegenwartsphilosophie, H. 9). Leipzig, Hirzel. 1 M. 40.
- WENDT, H. G., Max Dauthendey, Poet, Philosopher (Columbia University germ. Studies, New Series, 2). New York, Columbia University Press.
- WERTH, E., Untersuchungen zu Chr. F. Gellerts Geistlichen Oden und Liedern. Breslau, Plischke.
- WIECHERT, E., Der Dichter und die Jugend. Leipzig, Volckmar. 2 M. 50.
- WIESCHEMANN, H., Das Ethos in den Romanen Otto Ludwigs. Bochum, Pöppinghaus.
- Wilhelm-Busch-Gesellschaft, Mitteilungen der, Nr. 5.
- WILHELMSMEYER, H., Carl Gustav Carus als Erbe und Deuter Goethes. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt.
- WOLFF, H., Die Dramen 'Halle und Jerusalem' und 'Die Gleichen' im Zusammenhang der relig. Entwicklung L. A. von Arnims. Göttingen, Tageblatt.
- ZOLLINGER, M., Gottfried Keller als Erzieher. Zürich, Gottfried-Keller-Gesellschaft.

[illegible]

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

BALANCE SHEET 30 SEPTEMBER 1936

LIABILITIES		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
<i>Capital Account</i>							
As at 30 September 1935	...	477	10	0			
<i>Add:</i> Donations received during year	...	14	1				
Life Membership subscriptions	10 10 0						
<i>Less:</i> Proportion transferred to subscriptions	3 10 0						
		7	0	0	485	4	1
<i>Sundry Creditors</i>							
Cambridge University Press							
For printing Bibliography, etc., 1935-36 estimate	...	200	0	0			
Cambridge University Press							
For printing <i>Modern Language Review</i> , Vol. 1936 estimate	...	200	0	0			
Subscriptions paid in advance	...	1 17	6				
Audit Fee	...	3 13	6				
					405	11	0
					£890	15	1
ASSETS							
<i>Cash at Bank (England)</i>							
On Deposit Account	...	675	3	11			
On Current Account	...	37	18	2			
					713	2	1
<i>Cash at Bank (America) at 21 September 1936</i>							
<i>Sundry Debtors</i>	59	6	5
<i>Income and Expenditure Account</i>					88	19	0
Accumulated Deficit as at 30 September 1935							
<i>Add:</i> Deficit for year, per Account	...	28	8	5			
					29	7	7
					£890	15	1

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE AND REPORT

I have prepared the above Balance Sheet after examination of the books, records and vouchers relating thereto, and certify that, in my opinion, it shows the true and correct position of the Modern Humanities Research Association as at 30 September 1936. The Cash at Bank in America and the American Receipts and Payments for the period to 21 September 1936, are in accordance with the certified statement of the Treasurer in America.

(Signed) **W. ARMSTRONG**
Chartered Accountant.

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE
14 October 1936.

NOTES ON THE POEMS OF BERTRAN DE BORN¹

V

Song 19. Contained in MSS. ACDIKM.

For the date of this piece see note to *vv.* 1-7.

19. 1-7

Rassa, mes si son primier
En la fi que an parlada
Li senhor e·lh maisnadier
E·lh baro de l'encontrada.
5 S'ilh an fach ves vos passada,
Et ieu qual mal vos en mier,
Que terra non ai cobrada?

In *v.* 5 CM only read *S'ilh an fach ves vos passada*, as do also Appel (as above), Stimming³ and Thomas. The other MSS. (ADIK) show *E sil fant uas uos (nos IK) estrada*, i.e. 'and if they take the road towards you', i.e. 'if they take the same road as you do', which seems to suit the context rather better than Appel's reading: 'if they have gone over to you' (on *far passada* see *SW.* VI, pp. 114-15). In the rebellion of 1183 Geoffrey of Brittany (*Rassa*) had made peace with his father and also with his brother Richard early in July just before the capture of Autafort (6 July 1183) by Richard and his ally Alphonso II of Aragon (*Gesta*, II, p. 319); and his example had been followed by the other insurgents, including Ademar V of Limoges (as we have seen), save Bertran de Born who maintained a hopeless struggle for some little time till his castle was captured. Bertran complains that it was no crime on his part to have held out to the bitter end and that there is no good reason, now that peace has been made, why his land and castle should not be returned to him.

19. 15-21

15 Nos fom tal trenta guerrier,
Chascus ab chapa traucada,
Tuit senhor e parzonier,
Per cor de guerra-mesclada,
Qu'anc no n cobrem denairada;
20 Anz a·ls colps, quan ac mestier,
An lor . . . prestada.

In the last verse the MSS. read *an lor coreilla prestada* (AD), *an lor querrela prestada* (CIK), *na sa compainha cobrada* (M). As none of these give any sense, Thomas proposed the emendation *An lor coralha prestada*, which Stimming³ adopts. According to Stimming³ (p. 169) Bertran wishes to convey that the allies (Bertran and his friends) have had no

¹ Continued from *Mod. Lang. Rev.* XXXI, 1936, p. 33.

success (v. 19) because, when there was need for blows, they had lent out their courage and could make no use of it—that the allies had in fact lost heart. Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLIII, p. 94) has effectively disposed of this fantastic explanation; apart from the last verse, to be discussed presently, *denairada* can only mean ‘a denier’s worth’, here used to indicate the smallest possible amount, and *als colps quan ac mestier* cannot by hook or crook be twisted to signify ‘als es der Schläge bedürfte’. Adopting Thomas’ punctuation in v. 20 (a comma after *colps*, instead of after *anz* with Stimming), which is certainly right, the rendering is: ‘we were some thirty warriors, each with a cape full of holes, all lords and co-lords, for sheer love of the turmoil of war, for never did we gain by it a farthing’s worth; rather, whenever there was need, they have (here Bertran, having in mind v. 17, loses sight of the real subject) exposed their guts to the blows.’ I do not agree with Lewent (*ASNS.*, CXXXIII, p. 217) that *prestar coralha* is a puzzle (cp. such expressions as ‘prêter le flanc à l’attaque’), nor can I understand how he reads ‘Mut beweisen’ into it. Levy (*loc. cit.*) writes at great length in favour of the retention of *corelha*, without, however, reaching any conclusion. Appel’s rendering of the whole passage (*Bertran von Born*, p. 41), on the other hand, is practically identical with the one above.

19. 40 Qu’el miei luoc no sia oschada.

Oscar should not be rendered by ‘beschädigen’ (Stimming³), but, with PD, by ‘entailler’, ‘ébrécher’ (cp. Mistral *ousca*, ‘entailler, ébrécher’). Appel has ‘schärtig, schadhaft machen’.

19. 42 Ni mas us no mi agrada.

Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLIII, p. 96) is right in pointing out that *mais* of the MSS. should be kept and that the rendering is: ‘und es gefällt mir nicht einer mehr’. Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 41) follows suit.

19. 47-9 N’Atempre·l genzer m’agrada,
Que m’a per son messatgier
Del mon la razo celada.

Though found in C only, the reading *N’Atempre·l genzer* is the only one which furnishes a satisfactory meaning, unless one reads, with Chabaneau, *N’Atempres genseis*. In the absence of any clue as to the identity of *N’Atempre* (or *Na Tempre*) the allusion in the last verse must remain in obscurity; the reading of IK (*del nom* instead of *del mon*) may conceivably convey that the messenger had ‘hidden’, had failed to explain, the meaning of that strange name (*N’Atempre* or *Na Tempre*) to Bertran de Born.

It may be pointed out that the word *agrada*, in the same sense, occurs three times in this piece at the rhyme, a blemish occurring in two thirds of Bertran's poems and to which very little importance should be attached in establishing the text.

19. 50-3 50 Papiols, te drech sentier,
 No temas ven ni gelada;
 Dijas mī a mon Rainier
 Que sa proeza m'agrada.

Rainier is the pseudonym given by Peire Vidal, Bertran's contemporary, to Raymond Gaufridi Barral, viscount of Marseille, from 1178 to 1192. There is good reason to believe that Bertran borrowed the *senhal* from Peire Vidal to designate the same person, it being a common practice, once a certain troubadour had launched a pseudonym, for other troubadours to apply it to the same person. As Stroński points out (*Folquet de Marseille*, p. 32) this conjecture is fortified by vv. 36-9, which suggest that the individual indicated dwells beyond the limits traced by Bertran de Born from the Atlantic to Montpellier.

It may be added that the rhyme-order of these four verses shows that they ought to be printed as two *tornadas*, and that they occur in M only.

Song 20. Contained in MSS. ACDEFIK.

For the date of this piece see my article in *Modern Philology*, xxix, 1931, pp. 7-9.

20. 3-8 Tan es sotils mos genhs e m'artz
 Que mes m'en sui en tal enans
 5 Ez ai tan de sort
 Que ve·us m'en estort;
 Que comte ni rei
 No·m forfeiron rei.

In v. 5 A has *Esai* and CE *E ai*, the latter of which is adopted by Thomas (Addenda, p. 207) and, following him, by Appel (as above). If Thomas' reading is the right one, *sort* should be rendered by his 'chance' and not by 'Los, Geschick' (*Lieder*, Gloss.), and a comma placed after *enans*: 'so subtle is my wit and my art that I have put myself in such a favourable position, and I have so much luck that behold I have got out of the scrape; for Counts and Kings have done me no harm'. Stimming³ prefers to read *E sai tan de sort*, with *sort* in the common meaning of 'magic': 'and I know so much about magic that', etc.

It is misleading to say, as Stimming³ (p. 157) does, that *rei* in the last verse is used instead of *re*, for the sake of the rhyme. *Ei* from Latin *e* closed, instead of the normal *e*, at the rhyme, of which there are several examples in the poems of Bertran de Born (cp. note to 27. 33), is found in the poetry of troubadours of all districts, and was no doubt inherited

from the oldest troubadour, William of Poitiers, in whose dialect (Poitevin) it is the regular development.

20. 17-22

Quan fis es debes tolas partz,
 A me resta de guerra us pans.
 Pustela en son uolh, qui m'en partz,
 20 Si tot m'o comenzi enans'
 Patz no·m fai conort,
 Ab guerra m'acort.

Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLII, p. 267) wonders to what *o* (v. 20) can refer. I take it to be a reference, in a general way, to Bertran's quarrel with Constantine concerning Autafort: 'although I began this (business) first', with which Appel's 'verwünscht wer mir ihn nehmen will, begann ich auch zuerst!' (*Bertran von Born*, p. 39) seems to agree. Stimming³ renders *s'acordar* (v. 22) by 'sich vertragen' and Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) by 'zufrieden sein (mit)' which seem to me to miss the point, while Thomas' 'se plaire à une chose' is too colourless. Bertran wishes to convey that war and all that is connected with it finds in him a responsive chord—that fighting is his element.

20. 30-32

30per fort
 No conquerran trei
 Lo pretz d'un correi.

In v. 30 the MSS. read *E ia us per fort* (CE), *E iab mi per fort* (DIK), *E la mi per fort* (F), *Mas ia per nuill sort* (A). Stimming³ writes *E ja·me per fort* and Thomas *Ja ab mi per fort*. The passage is discussed by Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLII, p. 217) who proposes *E ja mais per fort*. Appel (*Lieder*, p. 49) suggests *Et a* (or *ab*) *mi per fort*. As all the MSS. have *ia* (*ja*), the former seems preferable.

20. 33-35

Qui que fassa sos bos eissartz,
 Ieu m'en sui totz temps mes en grans,
 35 Com puoscha aver quairels e dartz.

Appel (*Leider*, Gloss.) and Stimming³ render *bos* by 'Gehöltz'; but the proper form of the word for 'wood' is *bosc*, of which the accusative plural is *boscs* not *bos*. Whether it is permissible to allow, except in proper names, the reduction by Bertran of final *-scs* to *-s*, of which Levy (*SW.*, under *frese*) gives one example, is very doubtful. Moreover, the double accusative after *faire* is contrary to Bertran's practice (cp. 13. 39: *E·m fai de mos arbres eissart*). A way out would be to adopt *fassa de bos eissartz* of A and to introduce the normal form *boscs*: 'whosoever may make a felling of his trees (i.e. whosoever may clear his land in order to cultivate it), I have always striven', etc. The interpretation of Thomas

who takes *bos* as the accusative plural of the adjective *bô* has little to recommend it.

20. 41-45

Mos parzoniers es tan galhartz
Qu'el vol la terra mos enfans;
Et ieu vuolh l'en dar, tan sui gartz;
Puis diran que mals es Bertrans,
45 Quar tot no lo · i port.

Stimming's 'pflichtvergessen' for *gartz*, the nominative of *garson*, is a pure guess, and Thomas' 'bon garçon' is evidently prompted by the context. *Gartz*, which the *Donat Prov.* (43 b 11) renders by 'vilis homo', has here the meaning of 'knave', 'contemptible fellow'. The term was often applied to the 'valets d'armée' (cp. 41. 31), and as they were not armed and did not take part in the fighting, *gartz* took on a pejorative connotation: 'my partner (i.e. Constantine) is so impudent that he covets the land of my children, and I am such a contemptible fellow that I want to give some of it!' An exclamation mark is required after *gartz*, and in v. 44 I would read *dira · n*, referring to Constantine.

22. 49-52

No · m chal d'Autafort
50 Mais far drech ni tort,
Que · l jutjamen crei
Mo senhor lo rei.

Translate, in agreement with Levy (*SW.*, *drech* 9): 'as regards Autafort I need not any more do right or wrong (anything), for I believe in the verdict of my lord the King.' For *caler* expressing need or necessity see the Glossary to Appel, *Chrest.*⁶ In *Bertran von Born* (p. 39) Appel gives a different rendering, with *caler* in its usual acceptance: 'nicht schiert um Autafort mich Recht, und Unrecht nicht; denn nur dem Urteile glaube ich, das mein Herr König sprach.'

Songs 21 and 22. For these two sirventes, directed against Alphonso II of Aragon, see my article in *Modern Philology*, February 1937.

Song 23. Contained in MSS. ACDFIKMT.

The call to Richard the Lion-Heart in the fifth strophe that he should ask without delay to be crowned King of England, as his elder brother the Young King had been, points to a date not long after the death of the Young King (11 June 1183); so that this piece, with its spring opening, may be ascribed to the early part of the year 1184. This is confirmed by Bertran's friendly attitude towards Richard, from which he never swerved after the restitution to him of Autafort, and by his hostility to the malcontent barons of Aquitaine, his former allies, to whom he owed a grudge for having thrown up the sponge in the rebellion of 1183 and left him to fend for himself.

23. 1-8

Quan la novela fiors par el verjan,
 On son vermelh, vert e blanc li brondel,
 Ab la doussor qu'ieu sen al torn de l'an
 Chan autresi com fan li autre auzel;
 5 Quar per auzel mi tenh en mantas res,
 Quar aus voler tot lo mielhs qu'el mon es.
 Voler l'aus ieu et aver cor volon,
 Mais no·lh aus dir mon cor, anz lo·lh rescou.

Verjan (v. 1) can only signify 'branch' and cannot be rendered by 'Garten' (Stimming³) or by 'verger' (Thomas). *Brondel*, as the ending shows, are the smaller branches or 'twigs': 'when the new bloom appears on the branch, so that the twigs are red, green and white.' Appel's 'Busch' (*Bertran von Born*, p. 42) or 'Gebüsch' (*Lieder*, Gloss.) would give excellent sense; but *brondel* is not found with that meaning. With regard to *al torn de l'an* (v. 3), it should be remembered that in the Middle Ages the New Year was often reckoned to begin at Easter. In v. 4 *autre*, in spite of what Stimming¹ (p. 262) says, is not pleonastic, as the next verse shows, in which Bertran likens himself to a bird. The only real case of pleonastic *autre* (for which see Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.*, III, p. 73) occurs in 43. 23: *E fora mielhs . . . Que visques el que maint autre enoios*. In the last four verses Bertran is manifestly playing, intentionally, with the jingle *auzel*, *auzar* and *voler*, *volar*.

23. 9-10

Ieu no sui drutz, ni d'amor no·m fenh tan
 10 Qu'ie·n enrazo ges domna ni n'apel.

In v. 10 C reads *quel mon domna nonrazon*, DIK *quen rason domna damor*, T *causor deman a rescos*, and A *qieu en rason ges dompna*, while the verse is missing in M. Stimming¹ (*qu'el mon domna no'n rason ni n'apel*) adopts the reading of C which he modifies in the third edition to *Qu'e·l mon domna n'enrazo ni n'apel*, the version adopted also by Thomas. Appel's reading (as above) is practically that of A, which is the only MS. which shows *ges*. *Ges* does not seem to suit the context, and I would adhere to the reading of Stimming³ and Thomas: 'I am not a lover, nor do I trouble about love so much that I should solicit any lady about it or make a declaration of love.'

23. 12-16

Que lauzengier fals, enoios, fradel,
 Desensenhat, vila e mal apres
 An dich de me tan e·n son entremes,
 15 Que fan cujar que la genzer del mon
 Mi tenha gai, jauzen e desiron.

The rendering of Appel's text (as above) is presumably: 'for slanderers . . . have talked about me so much and have busied themselves with the matter, that they make people believe', etc. *E·n = e en*, however, seems somewhat forced, and perhaps the better reading is that of Stimming³ and Thomas (*An de me dich, tan ne son entremes, Que fan cujar . . .*), but

with a semi-colon instead of a comma after *dich*: 'for slanderers . . . have talked about me; they have meddled so much with the matter that they make people believe', etc. As an alternative one might place *ne son entremes* in brackets: 'for slanderers have talked about me so much (they have meddled with the matter) that', etc.

23. 19-24 Puois chastiar cujan en guerreian
 20 Nostre baro lo senhor de Bordel
 E per forza tornar franc e cortes,
 Mal estara, s'ancar vilas non es
 Tan que chascus aia gauch, sl·lh respon,
 E no·ls enoi si be·ls pela ni·ls ton.

Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLIV, p. 92) is not clear as to the meaning of vv. 22-3. The following rendering, agreeing substantially with that of Diez (*op. cit.*, p. 189), and based on the above text and that of Stimming³, with the substitution of a semi-colon for the comma after *respon*, appears intelligible enough: 'since our barons imagine to chastise the lord of Bordeaux (i.e. Richard) by waging war on him and by force to make him affable and well-mannered, it will ill become him if now he does not show himself so rude that each (of the barons) may be glad if he (Richard) deigns to give him an answer; and let it not annoy them if he flays and sheers them.' In v. 21 *franc* (cp. *SW.*, *franc* 5) has here the not unusual meaning of 'friendly, kindly, affable' and should not be rendered by 'edel' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss., and Stimming³) or by 'noble' (Thomas); it is synonymous with *cortes*.

23. 31-32 E tanta fam, tanta set e tan son
 Com el a trach d'Agen tro a Nontron.

It is preferable to see in *son* the more usual form of *som* in the sense of 'fatigue' (*SW.*, VII, *som* 2, and Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.) than to take the word, with Stimming³ and Thomas, as a deformation of *sonh*, due to the exigencies of rhyme.

23. 33-37 Una re sapchan Breto e Norman
 Et Anjavi, Peitavi e Mancel
 35 Que entro a Monferran
 E de entro a
 No·i aura un, no veia son arnes.

In v. 35 (the whole strophe occurs in CM only) C has *que dostavalhs entro a monferran* and M *que dostas uarus entro a monferran*, the first of which places may safely be identified as Ostasvals, OF. Ostesvaus, a pass in the Pyrenees, mentioned in *Gui de Nanteuil*, v. 41. In his edition of the poems of Bertran de Born Thomas writes *Altasvaus* and thought then that the place intended was the present Tavaud (Haute-Vienne) where stood a well-known priory in the Middle Ages; but he renounced that reading some years after* (*Annales du Midi*, II, 14 and *Romania*, XXII, 592) in

favour of Ostavals, in which he sees a deformation of Ostabat in the Basses-Pyrénées; so that Appel's note (*Lieder*, Gloss., p. 136) requires modification. In the next verse the choice lies between *e de roziers entro lai mirabelh* of C and *e del tibre entro a san marcell* of M. There can be no doubt that the first, emended to *E de Rosiers entro a Mirabel* (Stimming³ and Thomas) is by far the better, though it is doubtful to which of the several Rosiers Bertran is alluding: probably the one near Uzerche (Corrèze), as Thomas thinks.

23. 49-52

Sirventes, vai a'n Raimon Gauceran
50 Lai a Pinos, . . ma razo l'espel,
Quar tan aut son siei dich e siei deman
De leis que te Cabrera e fon d'Urgel.

For the blank in v. 50 of Appel's text (as above) the MSS. have *en* (DIK), adopted by Stimming³ and Thomas, *gen* (A), *que* (CMT), *e* (F). Thomas takes *espel* as from *espelar*, the existence of which in OP. is not proven, though OF. *espeler* might be alleged in its favour. It is safer to take, with Appel and Stimming³, *espel* as from *espelir*, corresponding to Mod. Prov. *espeli*, for which Mistral has 'éclore, faire éclore; découvrir, avouer, dire'. Mistral also quotes the phrase *acabo de l'espeli*, 'finis de le dire', with which, for the extension of meaning from 'to hatch' to 'to say', Mod. French *accouche(z)*, 'out with it', offers an interesting parallel. The original meaning of the word *espelir* appears to be 'to hatch' and the *Donat Prov.* (36 a, 42) glosses it as '*avem de ovo exire*'. Cp. the following example in the Provençal *Physiologus* (Appel, *Chrest.*⁶, 203, ll. 102-3): *Cant l'estrus a post son huou, el lo laissa estar, que negun cosselh no·l dona; et apres lo solelh lo coa el sablon e l'espelis*; and for the extended meaning, P. Cardinal (Appel, *op. cit.*, p. 115, vv. 41-4): *Sel qui no val ni ten pro per semblan, Pro ni valen no·s tanh que hom l'apel, Ni dreiturier, quan met dreg en soan, Ni vertadier, quan vertat non espel*. Thus, taking *razo* with Thomas in the sense of 'discours' (i.e. 'poem', in this case), *tan* in that of 'very' (cp. 14. 16), and deleting the comma after *espel* and placing a semi-colon after *Pinos*, we get, with the reading of DIK: 'sirventes, go to Sir Raymond Gauceran yonder at Pinos; in my song I declare to him that his words and his demands concerning her who holds Cabrera and was of Urgel are very high.' If an OP. *espelar* is admitted, I would render it not by 'interpeller' (Thomas), but by 'to explain', a not uncommon meaning of *espeler* in OF., and take it as an imperative following naturally on *vai* (v. 49), and with the same punctuation, render: 'sirventes, go to Sir Raymond Gauceran yonder at Pinos; in my song explain to him, set forth to him that', etc. Unfortunately there are no means of determining to what circumstances Bertran is

alluding. Stimming³ (p. 177) accepts the account of the *Razo*, according to which Raymond Gauceran, lord of Pinos in Catalonia, was paying court to Marquesa, daughter of the count of Urgel, Ermengaud VII (1154-83) and of Douce sister of Alphonso II of Aragon, and wife of viscount Pons Guiraut de Cabreira, a Catalan nobleman also known as a troubadour (on him see Milá y Fontanals, *De los Trovadores en España*, 1889 ed., pp. 269 ff.). But the allusion may be political. We know that Marquesa was an intermediary in the peace negotiated in 1192-3 between her husband and her uncle, Alphonso II of Aragon (Miret y Sans, *Estudis Universitaris Catalans*, iv, p. 311). Can it be that at an earlier date Marquesa had played the same role and that Raymond Gauceran, whose terms had been found to be very exacting, had acted on behalf of his overlord, Alphonso of Aragon? If so, Peire Vidal is perhaps referring to this event (ed. Anglade², p. 39) in these verses:

Chanso, vai t'en al bon rei part Cerveira,
Que de bon pretz non a el mon egansa,
Sol plus frances fos ves mi dons de Cabreira.

It may be added that, apart from the documents enumerated by Stimming³ (p. 177), the lord of Pinos is mentioned by Raimon Vidal in his didactic poem *Abrils issi' e mays intrava* (ed. Bohs, vv. 798-9):

E'n Raimon Gauceran s'estranch
De tot mal faire a Pinos.

Song 24. Contained in MSS. ACDIKRTUV and partly in a¹.

This sirventes has the same form as *La lauzeit' e'l rossinhol* of his contemporary Peire Vidal. Bertran de Born was probably the borrower, as no imitations can be put down to Peire Vidal, whose gifts as an inventor of new melodies are emphasized by the *vidas*.

For the date see the note to vv. 1-8.

24. 1-8

.....
.....
.....assaut ni cembel
No vim, mais aura d'un an;
5 E tenh m'o a gran afan
Quar ilh n'estan per paor
(E nos autre per s'amor)
Del senhor de Moherna.

The passage left blank by Appel runs as follows in Stimming³:

Mout m'es deissendre charcol
De guerra far ab chastel
E quar

In the first three verses ADIKUV read *Molt mes dissendre carcol de gerra far ab castel e car assaut ni cembel*; CRT *Greu mes defendre carcol (deisedre can col T) e sapchatz que no mes belh car assaut ni cembel*.

According to Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLIV, p. 94) AU read *car col* in two words. If *carcol* (*charcol* is Stimming's spelling) is read as one word, it can only be the noun, not otherwise attested, corresponding to Ital. *cargollo*, Span., Port., and French *caracol*, Cat., *caragol*, 'winding staircase', as Tobler pointed out long ago (Stimming¹, p. 277). Stimming³ accepts this view, though he stretches Tobler's 'Wendeltreppe' to the more general 'Treppe', and translates (see the note to 28. 1 of his first edition and p. 178 of his third edition): 'Sehr heisst es mir die Treppe hinabsteigen, mit einer Burg Krieg zu führen (aus der keine Ausfälle gemacht werden)'. Apart from the fact that the part of his translation in brackets does not find any correspondence in the text, Levy (*loc. cit.*) rejects this rendering on various grounds; he questions Stimming's interpretation of *descendre charcol* used figuratively, as well as the value he attributes to *de* at the beginning of the second verse and to *faire guerra ab alcu* in the second verse. He does not think that the text can be right as it stands and throws out the suggestion that possibly *descendre* should be split into *de* + some noun (*senhor*?), that *carcol* should be read as *car col*, the latter from *colre* in the sense of 'to abstain from' (cp. *SW.*, *colre* 4) and that the original had *Mal mes* instead of *Molt mes* or *Greu mes*: 'It displeases me concerning a lord? that he abstains from waging war with a ?', the second query referring to *chastel*, on the meaning of which Levy beats about the bush. His suggestion removes the grammatical difficulties, but has the great disadvantage of departing very widely from the MS. tradition. He adds that he is unable to quote any example of *colre* + infinitive. The following example from Aimeric de Pegulhan (Bartsch, *Chrest.*⁶, p. 178 b) shows that *colre* can be so constructed: *Teriaca, ges vostre pretz no col De melhurar, qu'oi val pro mais que hier*. I venture to think that a satisfactory rendering of the passage is possible by adhering closely to the reading of the group ADIKUV and by taking *col* as the first person present indicative of *colre* in the sense not of 'unterlassen' but of 'dulden, gestatten, zulassen' (*SW.*, *colre*, 2): 'to me it is to descend much (i.e. much of a come down) that I suffer the waging of war by means of a castle and that we have not seen assault or sortie for more than a year; and I hold it as a great tribulation that they abstain from it (i.e. assault and sortie) for fear of (and we for love of) the lord of Mouliherne.' For this figurative value of *descendre*, opposed the well-known use of *poiar*, cp. the following lines of Gaucelm Faidit (Appel, *Chrest.*⁶, p. 112, vv. 44-5):

Em pauc d'ora s'aven soven
 Qe, qan cui' om puia, deissen,
 Si c'ab desesperanza
 Il laissa tot e 's'lanza.

and for *cembel* in the sense of 'sortie' cp. *Erec.* 2236: *Devant la porte del chastel Ont recomancié le canbel Cil dedanz contre ceus defors.* It is not improbable that *castel* should not be rendered by 'castle' but that it stands here for the movable wooden towers with several stories employed in siege operations to which the term *castellum* was applied by the mediaeval chroniclers (cp. Alwin Schultz, *Das hofische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger*, 1880, II, pp. 359-60). Cp. *Ren. Nouv.*, 973: 'Li rois un castiel Ot de fust moult rice et moult biel. . . Celui a fait mener as murs De Malpertruis'; and in the *Carros* of Raimbaut de Vaqueiras, vv. 106 ff.: *Per los murs a fendre Fan engenhs e castels.*

The 'lord of Mouliherne', a place in Anjou, is Henry II, and in the next strophe (v. 11) *lo senher que te Bordel* is Richard whose staunch ally Bertran had become after he had been abandoned by his friends in the rebellion of 1183 which culminated in the capture of Autafort. From Bertran's lament that real fighting had not occurred for more than a year we may conclude that the present sirventes was written in the summer of 1184, a good deal earlier than Stimming³ and Thomas think. The fact that Bertran in the sixth strophe has another fling at Alphonso II of Aragon is a further argument in favour of that date. The *ilh* of v. 6 are the late rebels and *nos autre* of the next verse the adherents of Richard and his father, including now Bertran de Born.

24. 9-16

Que·ls aguza e·ls esmol
10 E·ls tocha coma coutel
Lo senher que te Bordel,
Mas trop son espes denan
E motz deves lo trenchan
E plus leial d'un prior.
15 Merce de l'esmoledor
Tuit venran a vida eterna.

Levy (*ASNS.*, cxliv, p. 94) wonders what can be the meaning of the last verses. I take it that Bertran's intention is to convey that Richard (*lo senher que te Bordel*), who is likened to a knife-grinder who puts the malcontent barons of Aquitaine on the whetstone but is unable to get any edge on them, has so far blunted their spirit that none of them now dare to kick against his iron rule; he has tamed them so thoroughly and they behave so well that, like a good prior, they shall gain a place in Heaven.

24. 33-40

Aragones fan gran dol,
Catala e cilh d'Urgel
35 Quar non an qui los chapdel
Mas un senhor flac e gran,
Tal que·s lauza en chantan
E vol mais deniers qu'onor
E pendet son ancessor,
40 Per que·s destrui et enferna.

Faire dol (v. 41) should not be rendered with Stimming³ by 'Schmerz bereiten, empfinden'. It is equivalent to *menar dol*, 'to lament', and is properly translated by Thomas (Intro., p. xxxiii) by 'les Aragonais mènent grand deuil.' In v. 44 *flac e gran* offers a problem not yet satisfactorily solved. *Gran* can hardly be *grandem* (Chabaneau, *RLR.*, xxxi, p. 609, and Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.), unless possibly it is stretched, *en désespoir de cause*, to mean 'lanky'. Stimming³ suggests that *gran* is a deformation of *gram* ('sad') to suit the rhyme. Levy (*ASNS.*, cxxiv, p. 95) objects that words in *-an* are so plentiful that there was no need to maim a word in order to secure the required rhyme, and that moreover the rhyme requires here a word with a fast *n*, which *gran* for *gram* would not have. His third objection to the effect that sadness is not necessarily a bar to good leadership (v. 43) or to honourable conduct (v. 46) implies an undue appreciation of logic by the troubadours, as the following verses of Bernart de Rouvenac, directed against Henry III of England, show, in which the epithet *marrit*, equivalent to *gram*, is associated with *flac*:

Rei engles prec que m'entenda,
 Quar fa dechazer
 Son pauc pretz per trop temer;
 Quar no·l plai que·ls sieus defenda,
 Qu'ans es tan flac e marritz
 Que par que si'endurmitz,
 Que·l reis frances li tol en plas perdos
 Tors e Angieus e Normans e Bretos.

Thomas (Intro., p. xxxiii) renders *flac e gran* by 'flasque et sans énergie', but does not explain how he gets 'sans énergie' out of *gran*. Levy (*loc. cit.*) suggests with all due reservation a present participle *flaquejan* instead of *flac e gran*. If there is no way out except by emendation this is perhaps the most likely correction, though I cannot help feeling that the combination of *flac* and *marrit* in Bernart de Rouvenac strengthens Stimming's *gran*=*gram*, for which cp. *Chinom* for *Chinon* (28. 13) and *Rancom* for *Rancon* (*ibid.*, 21).

The only poems extant of Alphonso II of Aragon are a *canso* (Bartsch, *Chrest.*⁶, p. 93) of no great merit and a *partimen* in which he replies not without spirit to a rather rude question addressed to him by Giraut de Borneil (ed. Kolsen, No. 59). In neither of these can he be said to blow his own trumpet; but there may have been others.

24. 41-45

Puois lo coms Richartz mais vol
 ...sai pres Bordel
 Que Conhac ni Mirabel
 Ni Chartres ni Saint-Johan,
 45 Grieu cobrera Botenan.

The strophe, missing in the other MSS., from which these verses are taken was discovered by Chabaneau in MS. 2814 of the Riccardi library at Florence (cp. *RLR.*, xxv, p. 237). It cannot, however, by any chance belong to the present sirventes, written, as we have seen, in the summer of 1184, because of the mention of Botenan, the Provençal form of Boutavant, the famous fortress of that name, built by Richard in 1196, three and a half kilometres south-west of Andely on an island in the Seine (cp. A. Cartallieri, *Philipp II August*, III, p. 140, Leipzig, 1910). Apart from that, the author's chronology is all wrong; Richard was King of England and not merely Count of Poitiers when he built Boutavant and it was not captured by Philippe-Auguste till 1202 after Richard's death, so that there could be no recovery or capture of the fortress by Richard.

24. 57-64

Ieu sai un auster terzol
 Mudat, qu'anc no pres auzel,
 Franc e cortez et isnel,
 60 Ab cui ieu m'apel Tristan;
 E tot per aital semblan
 A·m pres per entendedor
 Et a·m dat mais de ricor
 Que s'era reis de Palerna.

Neither Stimming nor Thomas throw any light on the meaning of the first six verses. We know from v. 65 that Bertran called his lady-love 'Tristan', and from v. 60 that they applied the same *senhal* to each other. The main obstacle lies in the word *semblan*, which I understand as practically equivalent to *senhal* (cp. *SW.*, *semblan* 11 and *semblensa* 6), in the sense of 'pseudonym'. The gist of the passage would then be: just because of such a fictitious name (i.e. the fact that she calls me Tristan), she, like another Isolt, has accepted me as her lover. Another possible interpretation would be to understand *semblan* in the sense of 'way, manner' (*SW.*, *semblan* 4 and 18): just as I am her admirer because I am called Tristan, in the same way, in such a way (but conversely) she has accepted me as her lover (cp. *ab autretal entresenh*, in 42. 39). Lastly Levy (*SW.*, VII, p. 541 b) wonders whether the meaning can be 'ich bin ebenso franc e cortez e isnel'. This, I venture to think, is the least likely of the three explanations.

With regard to *Palerna* (Palermo) in the last verse, it is worth noticing that AUV have *Palerma*, which shows that this form was not unknown to Provençal, contrary to what Thomas (p. 64) says. The form with *m* occurs not only in the four MSS. of the second letter of Raïmbaut de Vaqueiras (cp. Stimming³, p. 180), but also in all MSS. of Peire Vidal's *Bon' aventura don Dieus als Pisans* (cp. the critical edition in Crescini,

*Manuale*³, p. 484). The usual form *Palerna* is probably due to the influence of *Salerna* (Salerno).

24. 68-70

Puois la reina d'amor
M'a pres per entendedor,
70 Be puosc far cinc e ilh terna.

Stimming (first edition, p. 279 and third edition, p. 180) by referring the terms *cinc* and *terna* to the game of lottery, as does also Thomas who vouchsafes no explanation, and attributing greater value to *cinc* than to *terna* has completely falsified the meaning, which he interprets as follows: 'since the queen of love has accepted me as her lover, I may well gain five points and she three points', i.e. what I gain thereby is much more than what she gains. *Cinc* and *terna* are not technical terms borrowed from the game of lottery, but from the game of dice, in which *terna* is the throw which results in turning up the two threes (six points), and which consequently is a better throw than *cinc* or five points (cp. F. Semrau, *Würfel und Würfelspiel im alten Frankreich*, Halle, 1910, p. 30, and A. Jeanroy et Salderda de Grave, *Uc de Saint-Circ*, p. 214). According to Jeanroy (*RLR.*, XL, p. 390, note) 'tout le sel du vers réside dans la fatuité comique dont il est l'expression'. A fuller and more satisfying explanation is that of Crescini (*Studi medievali*, III, 1, 1930, pp. 9-10, of the offprint) in connexion with which it is well to remember that *entendedor* was the name given more especially to the lover who had but one more rung to climb in the *scala amoris* before winning the supreme favour: 'il poeta si sente coi felice d' essere stato assunto come intenditore dalla sua *reina d' Amor*, d'esser già salito al penultimo grado nell' ardua scala d' amore, che ben può egli far cinque, punto disgraziato, s' altro mai, ed ella invece *terna*, uno de' punti più desiderati e fausti, senza ch' egli n' abbia rammarico. La fortuna di lei gli farebbe piacere. E poi se tanta ventura gli sorride in amore, o che gl' importa il rovescio nel giuoco? Linguaggio figurato, attinto anche qui, come in tant' altri esempi, al giuoco dei dadi; che significa come a ogni sfortuna resti indifferente il poeta, da che il bene più bramato, il corrisposto amore lo rende felice.'

Song 25. Contained in MS. a¹ only and in rather a corrupt form. First published, diplomatically, along with other pieces from the MS. Campori, by G. Bertoni in *Studj di filologia romanza*, VIII, 1901, p. 428. See vol. IX, pp. 158-9 of the same review for some emendations to the text suggested by C. de Lollis. Published a second time with a short commentary by G. Bertoni in *RLR.*, LVII, p. 365 and two years later in *ASNS.*, CXXXIV, pp. 104 ff. by Stimming, who had omitted it

from his edition of the poems of Bertran de Born, with a fuller commentary, supplemented by some valuable remarks of O. Schultz-Gora. The piece, composed to mourn the death of Geoffrey of Brittany (*Rassa*), must have been written after 19 August 1186, when Geoffrey died.

25. 17-24	Verais coms, Alixandres volh Que · us fassa companhia lai, Ogiers e Raols de Cambrai, 20 Rolantz..... Et Oliviers..... Estols.....Oristanh, Guillems d'Aureng' e · lh plus prezat Que del mielhs del mon son crezut.	20
-----------	---	----

In v. 20 the MS. reads *Rolantz ab las vertut*, which is not only grammatically impossible, but short by two syllables. The gap can be filled by writing *lo coms* after *Rolantz* or by intercalating some dissyllabic adjective qualifying *vertut* and changing *las* to *sa* (*ab tota sa vertut*, for example). In the next verse the MS. has *oliviers so ceizinat*. De Lollis proposes the emendation *Et Oliviers son aizinat* (Bertoni reads *Ab Oliviers son aizinat*, without explaining the last word); he takes *son aizinat* tentatively as 'sono allogiati' and points in confirmation to the meaning 'to dwell' of *s'aizinar* (*SW.*, I, p. 44). Stimming holds that De Lollis' interpretation of *son aizinat* is undoubtedly right, an opinion I cannot bring myself to share. Might not *aizinat* be referred with more propriety to *s'aizinar* in the sense of 'to approach', the primitive value of the word (cp. *SW.*, *aizinar* 1), in which case *son aizinat* would be equivalent to 'near', 'intimate' friend, a most appropriate epithet for Oliver? But perhaps the most likely reading is that suggested by Schultz-Gora: *Et Oliviers son vezin*, *At* (, *Estols*, etc.), which, since *Et* does not appear in the MS., should be modified to *Ab Olivier* etc., in order to make *son vezin* grammatically correct. *At* would then stand for Hato, Ato, one of the twelve peers in the *Chanson de Roland* and in other OF. epics. In v. 22 the MS. shows *Estols de nem pie noristain*. There can be little doubt that De Lollis is right in identifying *Estols* with Estout de Langres (Lengres), mentioned in several *chansons de geste* (cp. E. Langlois, *Table des Noms Propres... contenus dans les Chansons de geste*, p. 207), and no doubt whatever that one ought to write *Oristain* (*Oristanh*) and see in this personage, with Schultz-Gora, the Oristain mentioned by Raimon de Miraval (*Gr.*, 406, 15), King or Duke of Brittany, whose name appears in the form *Arastagnus*, *Arastagus*, *Arastang*, in the Latin, Poitevin and Provençal Pseudo-Turpin (cp. *ZRP.*, xxvii, pp. 628-9). But if *Estols* is accepted and also *Oristain* for *noristain*, what is one to make of the three intervening syllables of the MS. (*de nem pie*), which are unintelligible? As Estout is

generally known in the OF. epic as Estout de Lengres (Langres), Bertoni writes *Estols de Langr'* and Stimming *Estoutz de Lengres*, neither of which bear the slightest resemblance with the MS. reading. The middle part of the verse appears so hopelessly corrupt that almost any reasonable emendation is permissible; and I wonder whether *Estols*, *Naimés ab Oristain* (*Oristanh*), which has at all events the advantage of accounting for the accusative *Oristain*, is not nearer to the original than Bertoni's *Estols de Lengr' e Oristain*? Taking into consideration these various points, vv. 21-24 might be reconstituted as follows:

Rolantz, lo coms, ab sa vertut,
Ab Olivier, son vezin, At,
Estols, Naimés ab Oristanh,
Guillems, etc.

25. 25-29

25 De Lerida jusq'a Vernolh
Ni.....
Ni d'outra la mar ni de sai
No portav' anc princeps escut,
Tan s'agues de bon pretz levat.

The MS. reads in the second verse *ni dal paroci enuui* (one syllable short), which probably hides one or two place names from west to east, matching Lerida and Verneuil (v. 25) in the south (Catalonia) and north (France, dép. Eure) respectively. If so, it may be that *paroci* is a corruption of Parentis in the north-western corner of the Landes and that *enuui* should be emended to *en lai*, as Bertoni conjectures, who writes: *Ni da'l Parentisi en lai*. But Parentis-en-Born was never called 'Parentisi', a form invented by Bertoni in order to supply the missing syllable presumably, or 'lo Parentisi', so that his version would require some modification to *Ni da Parentis tro qu'en lai*, or the like. A less violent emendation would be *Ni dal Peiro ni tro qu'en lai*. This, however, would not satisfy what was probably an intended geographical contrast. De Lollis thinks that the last five syllables of the MS. reading stands for a *Rocianvai*, a deformation of a *Roncesvau*, for the sake of the rhyme; and that the name of some place which he leaves unspecified, situated eastwards as opposed to Roncevaux, is hidden in the second and third syllables of the verse. The conjecture of De Lollis, for the last part of the verse, looks more probable than any of the emendations with which I am acquainted and has the advantage of adhering pretty closely to the MS. True it makes large allowance for the tyranny of rhyme, though similar defacements of proper names especially, for metrical reasons, are not uncommon among the troubadours. There remains unexplained the first part of the verse for which I suggest tentatively that the original may have been *Ni dal Far*, so that the whole verse would read: *Ni da-l Far a*

Ronciavai, or, with a less defaced form of the usual *Ronsasvals*, *Ni dal Far tro qu'a Roncisvai*. *Lo Far* is the name given by the troubadours to the Straits of Messina (cp. Chabaneau-Anglade, *Onomastique des Troubadours*, p. 122) and would furnish the name of the place to the east required to balance Roncevaux in the west.

25. 32-34

S'Artus, lo senher de Cardolh,
Cui Breton atendon e mai,
Agues poder que tornes sai.

E mai, which can only mean 'in May', is padding pure and simple; there is no evidence that the Bretons expected the return of Arthur from Avalon in May rather than in any other month.

25. 41-48

Sa onor fara, si l'acolh
En sa cort, car anc non ac mai
Tan ric.....
Ni tant aura de pretz agut,
45 Que so dont eron descuidat
Escem e sobrier e manh,
El reteni' a doble grat
D'aquels qui l'avion vezut.

In v. 43 the MS. reads *tan ric ni aitan bon eschai*. De Lollis interprets *eschai* as another form of *eschach*, *escag* (*SW.*, III, p. 137), 'part', 'share', 'portion which falls to one's lot', referring to God, and would presumably render the passage as follows: 'He will do honour to himself, if He welcomes him in His court, for He never had so precious or so good a portion, nor will He ever have had so much excellence (as in the person of Geoffrey).' This interpretation is by no means convincing and moreover it does not agree with what is said in the remainder of the strophe. I agree with Schultz-Gora that no satisfactory meaning can be extracted from *eschai* of the MS. and that *bon eschai* should be emended to *bo no sai*, with in addition the correction of *ara* (v. 44) of the MS. to *aia* instead of to *aura*: '...for there never was one so noble (as Geoffrey), nor do I know of one so good, nor one who has had so much glory.' Taking *escem* of the MS. as = *escem*, *essem*, a secondary form of *ensem*, reinforcing *e...e*, the rendering of the last four verses appears to be. 'for what the powerful together with the great were unmindful of, he upheld, and won thereby the twofold gratitude of those who had seen him.'

25. 49-51

Pres es jos de l'aussor capdolh
50 Pel conte que tena·l rai.
E jovenz tornatz en esmai.

The correction of *jois* of the MS. to *jos*, first proposed by Schultz-Gora, can be regarded as certain, and also his rendering of *rai* by 'spoke', the meaning being that Glory is fallen from its highest point because of the death of Count Geoffrey who held the spokes of the Wheel of Fortune.

Song 26. Contained in MSS. ACDD^cEFIKNa¹.

Both the structure and rhymes, as well as the rhyme-word *genta* in the fourth verse of each strophe, are borrowed from Raïmbaut d'Aurenga's *Entre gel e vent e fanc*, of which A. Kolsen (*Dichtungen der Trobadors*, III, p. 232) has given a critical edition.

This and the next piece refer to the war between England and France which had been threatening for some time and broke out again in 1187. The main cause of the renewal of the old conflict was Richard's refusal to marry Alaïs of France or, failing that, to restore to the French Crown Gisors and the Norman Vexin which constituted her dowry. The King of France also demanded that Richard should do formal homage to him as overlord for the county of Poitou. Added to this was also the question of the guardianship of the heir to the county of Brittany, which arose after the birth of Arthur in March 1187. On 17 February 1187, Henry II came over from England with a considerable army. A meeting which took place between the two kings, early in April, near Nonancourt, lead to no result. Only with the greatest difficulty and under pressure from the papal legates was a truce till Midsummer day agreed upon, with the object no doubt of giving each side time to collect its forces. Philippe-Auguste, however, seeing he could obtain no satisfaction by negotiation, invaded Berry before the truce had lapsed, seized Issoudun and Graçay and laid siege to Châteauroux, which was defended by Richard and his brother John. Upon the approach of Henry II and the rest of the English army, Philippe raised the siege and decided to try his fortune in the open field. On the eve of St John the two armies faced each other ready to engage next morning; but at the last moment the conflict was averted by the intervention of Richard who went over to the French camp and did homage to Philippe-Auguste, with whom he was anxious to become reconciled, as through him alone he hoped to retain his future inheritance unimpaired. With the help of the papal legates, a second truce, to last two years, was arranged, according to which the King of France was to retain Issoudun and his other conquests in Berry, but all other contentious matters were to remain in abeyance.

There is no evidence that Henry II won back Issoudun, as Bertran states (27. 18), or that the men of Champagne were bribed by English gold (*ibid.*, 27-8).

It may be added that the *Razos* to these two sirventes contain several gross errors; they place No. 26 after No. 27, and talk of a truce of ten years instead of one of two years.

26. 8-14

Per que·m pesa quar m'estanc,
 Qu'ieu ades no pas la festa,
 10 Qu'us sols jorns mi sembla trenta
 Per una promessa genta
 Don mi sors . . . et esglais;
 E no vuolh, sia mieus Doais
 Ses la sospeisso de Cambrais.

I think that Stimming³ (p. 33) is right in supposing that by *la festa* (v. 9) is meant Midsummer day, on which day was to terminate the first truce negotiated in 1187 between the kings of England and France: Bertran who is longing to see hostilities break out again is vexed that he is rooted to the spot and that he does not at once 'pass' (CE have *vey*) the day on which the truce is to expire. Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLIV, p. 98) questions this interpretation and asks whether perchance *passar la festa* is an expression signifying 'fröhlich sein, glücklich sein', which, however, he is unable to corroborate in any way. Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) renders *passar la festa* by 'das Fest begehen, feiern', and in *Bertran von Born* (p. 48) he translates the first two verses: 'drum ist mir leid, dass ich verzeihe und nicht alsbald das Fest geniesse.' There is no warrant for attributing either of these meanings to *passar la festa*. The *promessa genta* (Bertran is of course speaking ironically) can be understood as the assurance of Philippe-Auguste and Henry II not to break the peace before Midsummer day. Between *sors* and *et esglais* (v. 12) the MSS. have *trebalhs* (ADD^cFIK), *temors* (CE), *trebols* (N), *trentols* (a¹), an *embarras de choix* from which we may select *trebalhs* (Stimming³ and Thomas), or *tremols*, as Appel suggests. In v. 14 *de Cambrais*, as if the *s* belonged to the stem, is incorrect and ascribable to the requirements of rhyme. Cp. note to 8. 55 and Falquet de Romans, 156, 8, vv. 6-7: *Que melh non pres a Raol de Cambrais Ne a Flori can poget el palais*.

26. 15-21

15 Guerra ses fuoc e ses sanc
 De rei ni de gran poesta
 Qu'us coms laidis ni desmenta,
 Non es ges paraula genta.
 Qu'el puous si sojorn ni s'engrais!
 20 E joves cui guerra no pais
 N'esdeve lieu flacs e savais.

Laidis (v. 17) can be construed either as the third person sing. pres. ind. or as the third person sing. imperf. subj. of *laidir*. In the first case one would have a mixture of two moods in a relative clause (*laidis* and *desmenta*); in the second two different tenses of the same mood. To obviate this, Tobler (Stimming¹, p. 232) suggested the reading *laidei* from a hypothetical *laideiar*. A better way, I think, of meeting the difficulty is to write with the other group of MSS. (CE) *o* in lieu of *ni* and *laidisc'*, a very slight emendation, instead of *laidis*: *laidisc' o desmenta*. In vv. 17-18

I would place an exclamation mark after *desmenta* and delete any punctuation after *genta*, so as to make v. 19 depend on v. 18: 'war without fire and without blood on the part of a king or of a powerful lord whom a count insults and gives the lie to! It is not a nice word that he (the king or powerful lord) should after that rest and fatten himself.'

26. 22-23

Pustela en son uolh e cranc
Qui ja mais l'en amonesta!

The meaning seems to be: a curse on the one who exhorts Philippe-Auguste to negotiate a peace instead of fighting it out.

26. 47-49

Ni om plus volontiers no trais
Ni no fetz cochas ni assais
Ab pauc de gens ni ab gran fais.

Traire cocha I understand as equivalent to *traire bataille* (SW., *traire* 30), and to *assai* I would assign the same meaning as in 21. 30: 'no man more willingly fought battles or performed heroic deeds with few men and with great hardship.' For another example of *assai* with this value see vv. 101-3 of the 'Carros' of Raïmbaut de Vaqueiras: *Ueimais Veirem de grans assais: De totas partz comens on a combatre*.

26. 50-53

50 Lo reis Felips ama la pais
Plus que l'bos om de Tarantais.
En Oc-e-No vol guerra mais
..... us dels Algaïs.

The Algaïs, we are told by the author of the *Razo*, were four brothers, notorious highwaymen, who commanded a group of quite a thousand men on horseback and double that number on foot, and who lived exclusively on the proceeds of their brigandage. Martin Algai is the only one of the brothers whose activities are recorded by the chroniclers. In 1196 he appears to have been in the pay of Richard the Lion-Heart (Mathew Paris, *Hist. Major*, ed. Luard, II, p. 421); and a few years later (1203) we find him occupying the position of Seneschal of Gascony and Périgord, to which he had been appointed by John Lackland (*Rotuli litterarum patentium*, I, p. 28 b). During the Albigeois crusade he was at first on the side of the crusaders, but afterwards went over to the Count of Toulouse, who entrusted him with the defence of the castle of Biron. When the castle was captured by the crusaders, in 1212, Martin Algai, by order of Simon de Montfort, was dragged to death by a horse and afterwards publicly hanged, we learn from the *Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois* (vv. 2450-56):

Li coms e li crozats s'en van per mei la estreia
Al castel de Biron l'ouriflame leveia;
Mot l'agron viatz pres sens autre demorea;
Marti Algai aucizon a mort desonorea:
A cheval l'en fan traire, so es veritats proea,
E puis si fon pendutz totz en la prea.

The troubadour Uc de Saint-Circ alludes to Martin Algai in a piece in which, addressing himself to the Count of Rodez, he tells the count that a man is no better off in his company than in that of Martin Algai (ed. Jeanroy-Salverda de Grave, p. 120). Peire Cardinal has also a reference to the Algaïs in the sirventes *Razos es qu'ieu m'esbaudei* (Raynouard, *Choix*, iv, p. 362), from which we may conclude that the fate of the other brothers was not less ignominious than that of Martin. According to Pierre de Vaux-de-Cernay (*Historia de factis et triumphis memorabilibus nobilis viri domini Simonis comitis de Monteforti*, c. 56), Martin was a Spaniard (cp. Paul Meyer, *La Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois*, Paris, 1875-9, p. 109).

I agree with Thomas that a comma should be placed after *Tarantais* and that *En Oc-e-No* should be written *E N'Oc-e-No*, which makes the verses run more smoothly. In the part of the last verse left blank by Appel Stimming³ adopts the reading of ADIK (*Plus que non fetz us dels Algaïs*). Thomas gives preference to the version of C (*Que no fai negus dels Algaïs*), to which approximates that of F (*Qe no vol negus dels Algaïs*) and that of a¹ (*Non vol negus de los Algaïs*). His reading has the advantage of suppressing the second, redundant *plus*; while chronology clearly demands the present tense (*fai*), since the Algaïs, or at least the most notorious of them, Martin Algai, was very much alive in Bertran's time.

Song 27. Contained in MSS. ABCDEFIKRUV.

27. 10-11 Cinc duchatz a la corona francesa,
E, si·ls comtatz, son a dire li trei.

No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the expression *esser a dire*, OF. *estre a dire*, 'to be lacking', which survived in French till well in the seventeenth century. See *RLR.*, III, p. 71, and recently, L. Foulet, in the *Mélanges Jeanroy*, 1928, p. 165.

27. 15-21 15 Ges aitals patz no melhura proesa
Com aquesta ni outra.....
Ní deu sofrir qu'om li bais sa richesa,
Puoís Essaudu a tornat debes sei
Lo reis Enrics e mes en son destrei.
20 E no·s cuich ges qu'a son ome s'autrei,
Si·l fieu d'Angieus li merma una tesa.

In v. 16 Stimming³ and Thomas read *Com aquesta ni outra qu'om li grei*. Because it does not appear clear to Levy (*Litblatt*, xi, p. 239) who is the subject of *deu* (v. 17) and to whom *li* (v. 16) refers, he is inclined to give preference in v. 15 to the version of CER (*ges aital fi no met reys en proesa*); but apart from the fact that the meaning he attributes to the reading of CER is very problematical, *deu* and *li* clearly refer to *la corona rancesa* of v. 10 in the preceding strophe, as does indeed the whole of the

third strophe quoted above. The real crux resides in *v.* 16. Of the eleven MSS. DFIKUV have in the second hemistich *ni autra com li grei*, AB *ni autra com lo grei* and CER *ni lautra non lagrei*. Both Stimming and Thomas assume the existence of an unattested verb *greiar* corresponding to OF. *greer*. Stimming renders this hypothetical verb by 'gewähren' or 'grant', which gives excellent sense: 'such a peace as this one or any other which one may grant her (the French Crown) does not improve honour'; Thomas by 'agrée', which is impossible with the reading he adopts. Though there is nothing inherently improbable in assuming an OP. *grejar* = OF. *greer*, either as a transitive verb ('to grant') which Stimming's reading requires, or as an intransitive verb ('to please') with the reading *com* (= *com que*) *li grei* ('however much it may please her'), the safer course is to see in *grei* the third person sing. pres. subj. of *grejar* = *greujar* and, with *com*, to render regularly: 'or any other (peace), however much it may pain her (the French Crown).'

In *v.* 17 *richesa* should not be translated by 'Besitz' (Stimming³), which does not agree with *baisar*, but by 'power, might'. Following Thomas, I would place a full stop at the end of this verse and at the end of the previous verse; and also a comma at the end of *v.* 19, in which case *E* of *v.* 20 would introduce the Nachsatz. In *v.* 20, missing in CERV, the choice lies between *E nois cuich ges* of AB, adopted by Appel (as above) or *E noi cuges* of DFIK (emended unnecessarily to *E no·s cuges* in Stimming³), the latter of which is perhaps the better. Taking into account these various points, the rendering of the whole strophe would run as follows: 'such a peace as this does not improve Honour, nor does any other, however much it may pain her (the French Crown). And she (the French Crown) ought not to suffer that one should lower her power. Since King Henry has turned Issoudun to his side and brought it within his power, she (the French Crown) ought not to think that he will acknowledge himself as her liegeman, if she (the French Crown) diminishes for him by an ell the fief of Angers.'

To revert to *grei* (*v.* 16), another possibility, suggested by Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.), is that it might be taken in the sense of 'zur Last machen, als Last auferlegen'.

27. 26-28

E no foron Anjavi ni Mancei,
Que d'esterlis foro·lh premier conrei
Que desconfron la gen champanesa.

It is now generally accepted that Levy's interpretation of *conrei*, who renders it by 'kriegerische Schar' (*SW.*, I, p. 331), a frequent use of the word in OF., is the right one, and that Thomas' 'préparatifs (militaires),

munitions', would be difficult to confirm. Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) has 'Truppen' in agreement with Levy. In v. 28 the reading of CER (first adopted by Thomas), as above, is certainly preferable to that of Stimming³ (*Que desconfis la lor gen champanesa*, according to AIK, in which it is not clear to whom *lor* might refer).

27. 33-35 E no semblet ges lo senhor d'Orlei,
 Que desarmatz fo de peior mercei
 35 Que, quan el chap ac la ventalha mesa.

Both Stimming³ (p. 184) and Thomas (p. 68) are of opinion that *Orlei* is a deformation of *Orliens*, the OF. form of Orléans. It seems more likely that *Orlei* stands for *Orles* (the form *Orlhes* occurs in *Girart de Roussillon*), becoming *Orleis*, *Orlei* (for the fall of the final *s* cp. *Francei*, v, p. 39), under French or Poitevin influence (cp. note to 20. 8), in the same way as *sei* (v. 18), *mercei* (v. 34), *Francei* (v. 39).

27. 40-42 40 E valgra mais, per la fe qu'ieu vos dei,
 Al rei Felip, comenzes lo desrei
 Que plaideiar armatz sobre la gresa.

Stimming's 'Streit' for *desrei* should be replaced by 'attaque', 'assaut' (PD.). Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) has 'Angriff'. Stimming also renders *gresa* wrongly by 'Sandplatz, Schlachtfeld', in spite of Chabaneau's explanation (*RLR.*, xxxii, p. 205) who translates it by 'grève' or 'shore'. The word here is specific and not general: both armies, we know, were drawn up on opposite shores of the Indre, on *la riba de l'aiga*, as the author of the *Razo* states.

27. 47-48 Que marves puosc jurar sobre má lei
 Que·l melher es del mon e·l plus cortesa.

The adverb *marves* or *manbes*, of which so far seven examples under the first form and two under the second form have been found, except in one case, is always used in combination with *jurar*. According to C. Brunel (*Romania*, LI, 1925 pp. 557-60) this fact makes it very probable that *manbes* or *marves* (cp. the doublets *anma* and *arma*, *monge* and *morge*) is derived from the ablative *manibus* and that *manbes* or *marves jurar* is the exact reproduction of the well-known formula *manibus jurare*, 'jurer en personne, effectivement, réellement'. This derivation, accepted by Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.), with which may be compared that of Schultz-Gora (*ASNS.*, cxxxiii, 1915, pp. 411-13), helps to determine the meaning of the word, about which there has hitherto been some doubt.

Song 28. Contained in MSS. ACDFIKMRTUVa¹.

This sirventes in *rims estramps* (cp. *Leys*, I, p. 150, and Bartsch, *Jahrbuch*, I, p. 176), or rhymes which find no correspondence in the

strophe itself but only in the following strophes, is imitated from the song *Si·m fos Amors* of Arnaut Daniel (ed. Canello, p. 117). Bertran even borrows several of Arnaut Daniel's rhyme-words. The form of Arnaut's piece was also imitated by Guillem Durfort (Appel, *Prov. Inedita*, p. 130) and by Uc de Saint-Circ (ed. Jeanroy-Salverda de Grave, p. 203). Cp. Maus, No. 815.

For the date (May-June 1188) see Stimming³ (p. 37).

28. 4

Per que·m platz be dels reis vezer la bomba.

The meaning of *bomba* here (there is another word *bomba* = 'mace', also with a closed *o*) is by no means certain. Stimming³ renders it by 'Aufzug' and Thomas by 'pompe, faste', which *PD.* adopts. Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) has 'Aufwand, Gepränge', but asks whether Mistral's *boumba* 'heurter avec force, agiter l'eau avec une perche' may not be the right clue.

28. 21-24

Mas non ai ges Lizinha ni Rancom,
Qu'ieu puoscha lonh osteiar ses aver;
Mas ajudar puosc a mos conoissens,
Escut al col e chapel en ma testa.

Thomas prefers *de mos conoissens* (v. 23), the reading of the majority of the MSS., and takes *conoissen* in the sense, adopted by Stimming³ (who reads *a mos conoissens*), of 'voisin, ami, connaissance'. According to Thomas' reading the rendering is '...but I can help with my friends'; according to that of Stimming, either 'but I can help (*auider ad alcu*) my friends', or (with *a=ab*), 'but I can help with my friends'. In the first and third renderings *de* and *a* (*ab*) express the instrument, and either seem suitable; in the previous verses Bertran says in effect that he is not rich enough to wage war at a distance, which he qualifies by the statement that he is nevertheless ready to give a helping hand by enlisting the assistance of his friends and neighbours. Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 53, note) thinks that *conoissen* indicates one who is in debt and wishes to recognize (*conoisser*) his obligations, and translates: 'doch denen, die sich mir erkenntlich zeigen, kann ich zur Hilfe sein.' In *Lieder* (Gloss.) he renders *conoissen* by 'dankbar'. Apart from other objections, this interpretation does not seem to fit the two preceding verses.

28. 25-26

25 Si·l reis Felips n' agues ars' una barja
Denan Gisortz o crebat un estanc.

The famous fortress of Gisort was on the Epte, a narrow stream which was not navigable except for very small craft; but Bertran is speaking ironically and mockingly, obviously.

28. 39-40

Que no·m mante jorn, terme ni convens,
40 Per que mos jois, qu'era floritz, bissesta.

Levy in *PD.* under *bisestar* reproduces Thomas' *se flétrir* (both with a query) and thus rejects tacitly any connexion with *bissextus* favoured by several scholars (cp. *SW.*, I, p. 146 b), who attribute to *bisestar* either the meaning 'hinausgeschoben werden' (Suchier), supported by Mod. Prov. *bissesta*, 'retarder', or 'im Unglück sein' (Stimming³), 'Zum Unheil ausschlagen' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.), according as they insist on the original or figurative meaning of *bissextus*. The objection to attributing either of these two meanings to a verb *bisestar*, not attested in OP., is that the word *floritz* demands clearly a word contrasting with it, which accounts for Thomas' 'se flétrir', a pure guess, prompted by *florir* in the sense of 'to bloom'. In view of this I venture to suggest that *bissesta* or *bisesta* should be written *bis s'esta* or *bis esta*, *bis* ('brown, dark, black') contrasting with *floritz*, 'white with flowers, white' (cp. *PD. florir*), with which may be compared the use of *blanc* in the opening verse of No. 26: *Al doutz nuou termini blanc Del Pascor*. It may be noted that *bis* is used figuratively by the *trouvère* Blondel de Nesle (xvi, 4: *devient mes cuers noirs et bis*), and that there is a similar use of the synonymous *brû* in Rambertino Buvaelli's *Pois vei que·l temps s' aserena*, v. 35: *car mos cors no·s refrena D' amar lieis, que tant m'es dura, M'es sos cors escurs e brus*.

Song 29. Contained in MSS. CRa¹.

On the date of this piece see my article in *Romania*, LVII, pp. 479 ff.

29. 4-7

Be feira tan qu'a totz feira saber
5 Del rei Felip.....
E quals dols es quar el be non es pros
E quar Peitieu vai ab Franza merman.

In the second hemistich of v. 5 CR read *qual mortz (mort R) e quals (cal R) dans*, which the rhyme forbids; MS. a¹ has *gal dolor e caldan*, which need not entail the change to *e qual dol son* in the next verse. The real difficulty lies in the last verse. Stimming³ leaves it unexplained and the note of Thomas (p. 73) affords no help. From the general tenor of the piece, it is manifest that Bertran's purpose is to belittle Philippe-Auguste and to extol Richard's prowess. The above version, according to CR, does not convey that impression: '...and what a pitiable thing it is that he (Philippe-Auguste) is not indeed worthy and that Poitiers (i.e. Richard) together with France is diminishing.' The right reading is that of the third MS. (a¹): *e quar Peiteu* (there is no need to emend to *Peiteus*, the more correct form of the nominative) *vai si Franza merman*, which suits admirably: '...and what a pitiable thing it is that Poitiers

(Richard) diminishes (i.e. humbles) France (Philippe-Auguste) to such an extent.'

29. 8-14

...Richartz pren lebres e leos,
Que no·n rema per plas ni per boissos;
10 Enanz los fai dos e dos remaner
Per sa forza, qu'us no·s n'ausa mover;
E cuja be penre d'aissi enan
Las grans aiglas ab los esmerilhos
Et ab buzacs metr' austors en soan.

In the first verse CR have *E si richartz* and a¹ has *E sen richartz* (= *Ez en Richartz*). The latter seems the better, an additional inducement for its adoption being that all the strophes except the first begin with *E*, which is probably intentional. Stimming³ reads *E sai Richartz*, but *sai*, introduced no doubt in order to balance *lai* of v. 15, is in none of the MSS. In the same verse one is tempted to emend to *pren ab lebres leos*, in keeping with vv. 13-14, in which it is said that Richard 'catches large eagles with kites and with buzzards brings falcons into contempt', in the sense that Richard, so formidable is he, can with insignificant military resources get the better of Philippe-Auguste's superior but inefficient forces, the buzzard, a kind of falcon, being looked upon as particularly ill-fitted for hawking. Cp. the OF. saying: *ja de buisot ne ferez esprivier* (*Proverbe au vilain*, ed. Tobler, p. 41).

29. 18-21

Quar pauc e pauc si laissa dechazer
Sai a'n Richart, que·lh a tolgut ogan
20 Engolesme, don s'es fachs poderos,
E Tolosa,.....

MSS. CR read *e Tolosa quel te sobre deman* (*demans R*), adopted by Thomas and Stimming³, who take, rightly I think, *quel*=*qu'el*. The other MS. (a¹) has ...*geil tol sobre deman*. I agree with Thomas (Gloss.) that *sobre* should be taken in the sense of 'malgré', corresponding to the use of *sur* in OF. (cp. *si me fait Amours languir et seur mon voloir chanter*, Blondel de Nesle, ed. L. Wiese, xii, p. 41): '...and Toulouse which he holds in his grasp in spite of his (Philip's) protest.' One might also understand *sobre deman* as equivalent to Mod. French *sur demande*: '... which he holds for the asking.' Either interpretation would suit the then historical situation. Chabaneau (*RLR.*, xxxi, p. 610) holds that *Tolosa* is not a second accusative to *a tolgut*, but that the last verse constitutes an independent clause in which *sobredeman* is a noun to be taken with *tener*. He would further substitute *que·l*, in which according to him *que* is expletive, for *qu'el*, and render: 'et Toulouse (le comte de Toulouse) se montre exigeant outre mesure'. The main objection to this interpre-

tation, apart from points of detail, is that it is not in harmony with the actions of the Count of Toulouse at the time.

29. 22-28

E puous non es per sa terra iros,
Membre·lh sa sor e·l maritz orgolhos,
Que la lascia e no la vol tener
25 (Aquest forfachs mi sembla desplazer),
E tot ades que s'en vai perjuran,
Que·l reis navars l'a sai dat per espos
A sa filha, per que l'ant' es plus gran!

In the first verse *sa terra* refers to *Engolesme* and *Tolosa* of vv. 20-21. Angoulême and Toulouse did not of course belong to Philippe-Auguste, but both the Count of Toulouse and the Count of Angoulême did homage to the French Crown as well as to the King of England. In v. 23 Chabaneau (*RLR.*, xxxi, p. 610) proposes to retain the accusative *marit* of C and R (the form *sor* would not stand in the way, as it can be used for both cases), and thinks that the subject of *membre* is the neuter pronoun understood. The following constructions of *membrar* as an intransitive verb occur, apart from its use as a transitive verb (*membrar alcuna re*) and as a reflexive verb (*se membrar d'alcuna re*), namely (a) *alcuna re me membra*, with the thing or person recalled as subject and the person as indirect object, i.e. some thing or person comes to my mind; (b) the impersonal use: *membra me d'alcuna re*. *Membra me alcuna re* is not found, as far as I am aware; so that Chabaneau's proposal is unacceptable. Stimming's correction of *marit* to *maritz* is thus justified and the verse in question offers an excellent example of construction (a), the use of the singular verb after two singular subjects being quite in order. With regard to *marit* it may be pointed out (there is a similar loose use of *espos* in v. 27, as Richard did not marry Berengaria of Navarre till 1191) that Richard never became the husband of Alaïs of France, Philippe's sister, to whom he had been engaged since 1169. After her betrothal to Richard she was taken, according to the custom of the time, to the English court to be brought up there till she reached nubile age; but she was seduced by Henry II and became his mistress in succession to Rosamond Clifford, a fact of which Bertran was no doubt cognizant and which lends additional sting to his taunt.

In v. 25 there need not be infraction of the flexional rule if *desplazer* is construed as an infinitive: in v. 28 the infraction can be met by reading with Levy *per qu'el ant' a plus gran* and in v. 35 (which I include here for convenience sake) by substituting *ab Bertran* for *e'n Bertran*. In v. 25 Stimming³, and Thomas also, make *que* depend on *tot ades*, which they render respectively by 'besonders da' and 'maintenant surtout que', for

which it would be impossible to quote other examples. Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 36) makes *que* depend on *sembla* and suggests that *ades* here has the force of 'zugleich', like OF. *ades* 'sometimes': 'diese Missetat scheint mir ein Verdruss, und zugleich, dass er (Richard) dadurch meinedig wird.' If so, a semi-colon is required after *tener* and the bracket (v. 25) must be deleted.

29. 31-34

E ja Frances no n'aian bo esper,
 Quar qu'om sol sai tan temer:
 No prezan re lor dich ni lor deman
 Sai ves Peitau. . . .

In v. 32 CR read *Quar an lor tot* which Stimming³ emends to *Quar an lor tout* and Thomas to *Quar om lor tolt*. As the reference is to Philippe-Auguste, the emendation *Quar a lor tout*, suggested by Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 36) appears unavoidable, unless the right reading is to be found in *Qels obs lur es per quel deion temer* of a¹, in which, for v. 31, *noi haian* (*aver esper en alcu*) is preferable to *non aian* = *no n'aian* of the other MSS.

29. 36-40

E venran sai ab las novelas flors,
 E lor bobans sera de sobr' en jos,
 pro tener
 Que no tolam lo Mon pres Saint-Sever,
 40 A Rocafort tot quan tolgut nos an.

In v. 37 I would adopt the more forceful *chaira* of a¹, as against *sera* of CR. In the next verse CR read *e ian gasto nous* (*nons* C) *poira pro tener* and a¹ has *ni ia gascos no i poiran pro tener*, while in v. 39 CR show *nons tollan* and R *nos tollan* and a¹ has quite a different version (*Tro ge naion le pron pres ses saber*), which is obviously corrupt. If, for v. 38, the reading of a¹ is adopted, with the slight modification *Gasco* in lieu of *Gascos* and also Appel's emendation (*no tollam*), a satisfactory rendering results: 'and their overweeningness shall fall from up to down (i.e. shall be overthrown), and the Gascons will not be able to prevent us from capturing the Mount near Saint-Sever.' In v. 40 there is no doubt that the reading of a¹ (*E. Rocafort e qant tolgut nos an*) is the right one, in which case a comma is required after *Rocafort*. The reading of the other MSS. (as above) would imply that 'the Mount near Saint-Sever', the present Mont-de-Marsan, was at Roquefort, whereas, though close to each other, they are two separate places, both in the Landes. It may be added that in case, for v. 38, the reading of Stimming³, based on CR, is adopted (*E. ja·n Gastos no poira pro tener*), the historical allusion would remain the same, as the reference would be to Gaston VI, Count of Bearn (1173-1215) (see *Romania*, LVII, pp. 486-7).

Song 30. Contained in MSS. D^eFIKd.

For the date of this piece see Stimming³, p. 35.

30. 1-5 Nostre senher somonis el mezeis
 Totz los arditz e·ls valens e·ls prezatz,
 Qu'anc mais guerra ni cocha no·l destreis,
 Mas d'aquesta si te fort per grevatz;
 5 Quar presa es la vera crotz e·l reis.

Stimming³ (p. 184) thinks that *nostre senher* refers to Richard the Lion-Heart, and Thomas (p. 79) to our Lord. Verses 3 and 4 are hardly applicable to our Lord. They are in harmony with Richard's character; but, as Richard is specifically mentioned in the second strophe (*Cel qui es coms e ducs e sera reis*), I am inclined to share Appel's view (*Beiträge*, II, p. 59, note), according to which by *nostre senher* is meant the King of England (Henry II), who had taken the cross himself in 1188 and imposed on his subjects both in England and in his continental dominions a heavy tax for purposes of the crusade. Moreover, the appellation *nostre senher* is in keeping with *mo senhor lo rei annat* (15. 19) and *mo senhor lo rei* (20. 52), both of which refer without a doubt to Henry II. *Cocha* (v. 3), for which Appel has 'Not, Bedrängniss', I prefer to take in the sense of 'fray, mêlée', in agreement with Diez's 'Schlachtgewühl' (op. cit., p. 188).

30. 8-9 Que lo saintz fuocs i deissen (qu'om o ve,
 Per que no fai nul esfortz qui so cre).

Levy (*ASNS.*, CXLIV, p. 100) thinks that the second verse presents an example of the well-known expression *faire esfortz* (*SW.*, *esfortz* 4) in the sense of 'faire merveille' (*PD.*). It is to be noted, however, that in the examples of the phrase quoted by Levy *esfortz* is not qualified by any adjective; and moreover *esfortz* in its usual acceptation suits the context quite well: 'for the holy fire descends thereon, for one sees this (with one's own eyes), wherefore he who believes this makes (requires to make) no effort.' For the belief, widespread in the Middle Ages, that on Easter day the tapers on the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem were kindled by a flame coming from Heaven, see the interesting account of Ambroise (*Estoire de la guerre sainte*, vv. 8381-8428), who relates how this miracle happened on 4 April 1192, '*a grant Pasches le samedi*', Saladin being a witness.

30. 17-18 Qu'el vol lo pretz del mal e·l pretz del be:
 Tan ama pretz qu'ambedos los rete.

The meaning seems to be that Richard seeks distinction by his rough dealings with his enemies and by his kind dealings with his friends. He

loves distinction so much that he gains the admiration of his foes as well as of his friends.

Song 31. Contained in MSS. FIKd.

For the date of this piece see my article in *Romania*, LVII, pp. 499 ff.

31. 1-2 Ara sai eu de pretz, quals l'a plus gran
De totz aquels que's leveron mati.

Those 'who rose early' are those who, like Conrad of Monferrat, forestalling the laggards, rushed to the help of the hard pressed Christians in Palestine, after the crushing defeat inflicted by Saladin at Hittin (4 July 1187) on Gui de Lusignan, King of Jerusalem.

31. 15-21 15 Senher Conratz, tot per vostr' amor chan,
Ni ges no i gart amic ni enemí;
Mas per so·l fatz que·ls crozatz vau reptan
Del passatge qu'an si mes en obl.
No cujan qu'a Dieu enoia
20 Qu'ilh si paisson e si van sojornan?
Vos enduratz fam set, et ilh estan!

In the last verse IKd have *E uos* (which gives one syllable too many); F has *Eus* (= *E·us*), adopted by Thomas and Stimming³. One would expect the strong and emphatic *Vos*, and yet it is difficult to see how one can dispense with *E* at the beginning of the line. Thomas, like Appel, places a full stop after *oblí* (v. 18). Stimming³, on the other hand, prefers a comma. With his punctuation there is parataxis after the intensive adverb *si* and *No cujan qu'a Dieu enoia* is explanatory to the preceding verse: '...concerning the passage which they have so far forgotten that they do not think that (their behaviour) is vexing to God.' In keeping with this conception of the meaning, Stimming writes a semi-colon after *enoia* and a comma after *sojornan*, and takes the *Que* of v. 20 in the sense of 'for'. I do not think there is much to recommend the punctuation adopted by Appel in the last two verses. I prefer that of Thomas, who places a comma after *sojornan* and a full stop (for which an exclamation mark might be substituted to advantage) after *estan*. In view of *estar* ('ne pas bouger', *PD.*) in the last verse, I would interpret *si van sojornan* as 'enjoy themselves' (cp. *SW.*, *sojorn* 9), rather than as 'sich ruhen' with Stimming³ and Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 55), so as to avoid the repetition of the same idea and also because *se sojornar* so understood combines much better with *si paisson*. Should these various suggestions be admitted, the rendering of the whole strophe would run somewhat as follows: 'Sir Conrad, for the sake of you alone I sing, and pay no heed at all to friend or foe; but I do so because I wish to blame those who have taken the cross, on account of the journey they have so much forgotten.'

They do not think that it vexes God that they guzzle and enjoy themselves, and that you suffer hunger, thirst, and they do not budge!'

31. 26 Mas cel que i pert, no·lh par joia!

The MSS. (except F) have *que*, contrary to what Appel (*Beiträge*, I, p. 259) says, which he emends to *que i*, referring to God. One might take *qui* of F and interpret it as *qu'i*, which comes to the same thing, but entails no change: 'but to the One who loses in this, it does not appear a joy.'

31. 50-52 50 Bels Papiols, vas Savoia
 Ten ton camin e vas Branditz brochan,
 E passa·l mar, qu'al rei Conrat ti man.

As it is very doubtful whether in OP. the accusative of the feminine article can suffer enclisis (see J. Hengesbach, *Beitrag zur Lehre der Inclination im Provenzalischen*, Marburg, 1886, p. 83), one must either ascribe the masculine gender to *mar* (see note to 18. 53) or emend to . . . *vas Branditz brochan Passa la mar* . . .

31. 53-55 Quan seras lai.
 Tu li diras que, s'ar no·lh valh ab bran,
 55 Ie·lh valrai tost, si·lh rei no·m van bauzan.

In the first verse the blank is filled in F by *no tenoia* and in IK^d by *no tin noia*. As several words appear in Bertran's poems in a French or Frenchified form (cp. Appel, *Provenzalische Lautlehre*, § 15), we can, I think, assume, with Chabaneau (*RLR.*, xxxii, p. 205), who accepts the reading *no t'enoia*, as do also Thomas and Stimming³, that Bertran is here availing himself, for the sake of the rhyme, of the French practice, instead of following the Provençal usage which forbids the use of the imperative mood in order to express a negative command, though *no t'enoia* need not necessarily be construed as an imperative. Appel (*Beiträge*, I, p. 260) suggests the emendation *on te* (= *tê*) 'noia, but *tener enoia* is a strange expression, and Levy's *no t'enoia ja* with *ja* at the end of the line is hardly likely to be what Bertran wrote. In v. 55 it is preferable to take as Thomas does *Elh* of the MSS. as equivalent to *Eu·lh* or *Ie·lh* (as above) rather than to write *E·lh* (Stimming³) with *E* introducing the Nachsatz.

Song 32. Contained in MS. M.

In this piece the two strophes addressed to the *joglar* Folheta are followed in the MS. by strophes 1 and 6 (with slight modifications) of the song (No. 31) in honour of Conrad of Monferrat, and by an additional strophe and a *tornada*, lacking in No. 31 but dealing with the same theme as No. 31. Both Thomas and Stimming³ think that the matter which comes after the first two strophes has nothing to do with the sirventes addressed to Folheta, and Stimming adds that it was probably tacked on

by some scribe who happened to have an imperfect and slightly different copy of No. 31, because it happened to have the same metrical form as the two Folheta-strophes. Appel (*Studi medievali*, NS., II, 1929, pp. 404 ff.), on the other hand, expresses the view that the three strophes and the *tornada* which come after the Folheta-strophes in MS. M constitute the very song which Folheta asks of Bertran and which Bertran promises him; and that this song is none other, in a fragmentary and slightly different version, than the song addressed to Conrad of Monferrat. It might be objected that No. 31 is entrusted specifically by Bertran to Papiol, his favourite *joglar*; but if it is granted that the fragment of it which follows the Folheta-strophes represents an altered form of the same song, Bertran may very well have handed the revised version, at his request, to another *joglar*, in the person of Folheta. I can see no flaw in Appel's argument, which has the advantage of explaining in a natural way how it comes about that the Folheta-strophes have the same metrical form as the song celebrating Conrad of Monferrat, and also of accounting logically for the apparent lack of connexion between the two Folheta-strophes and the Conrad verses which come after them in MS. M.

32. 5-6

5 Mas vos vos tenetz a joia

Anta ab pro mais que onor ab dan.

In v. 5 the MS. has *mas vos o tenes* (= *tenetz*) a *joia*, which may be retained.

32. 45-49

45 E·l reis frances vai si trop apriman,

Et ai paor que venha sobre mi;

Mas anc al setge de Troia

Non ac tan duc, prince ni amiran

Com ieu ai mes per chantar a mon dan.

Stimming³ translates *s'aprimar* (omitted from Thomas' Glossary) by 'Pläne ausbrüten, grübeln'; PD. by 's'efforcer'; Appel (*Beiträge*, I, p. 260) *vai si trop apriman* by 'der wird mir gar zu fein', of which I do not quite grasp the bearing, while in *Lieder*, Gloss. he renders *s'aprimar* by 'sich hervortun, sich grosstun', which seems more appropriate in this context. *Venir sobre ad alcu* (cp. the *Razo* to 22. 22-3: *e·lh Juzieu li vengron sobre*), 'to fall on', 'to attack', is wanting in Stimming's Glossary and in that of Thomas also. *Metre al dan de alcu* (v. 49), not included in Appel's Glossary to *Lieder*, has not here its usual meaning of 'to despise, to brave, to mock at', but is to be understood in the sense of 'to turn to one's hurt', 'to turn against one'; the expression is closely akin to *esser al dan d'alcu*, 'to be ill-disposed towards one', which Levy (*SW.*, *dan* 3 and PD) is wrong to query, as the examples brought together by Jeanroy and Salverda de Grave (*Uc de Saint-Circ*, p. 181) clearly show. Cp. likewise the Glossary to *Flamenca*² under *Dans*, *dan*, and also the fol-

lowing additional instance from the Comtesse de Die, which by the way Mlle Kussler-Ratje (*Arch. Rom.*, I, p. 175), her latest editor, mistranslates:

Fis jois me don' alegransa,
Per qu'ieu cant plus gaiamen,
E non m'o teng a pezansa
Quar sai que son a mon dan
Aital lauzengier truan.

Song 33. Contained in MSS. CIKMd.

The form of this piece coincides with that of Raimbaut d'Aurenga's *Ara no siscla ni chanta* and was in all probability borrowed from him.

As in the fourth strophe England and Normandy are represented as belonging to Richard, this piece must have been written after his accession to the throne (6 July 1189).

33. 1-10

Anc no·s poc far maior anta,
Quan m'assols
Ni mi pres en dols.
E, puois ilh so a enquest,
5 E platz midons que m'esclava
Ni que·m lais,
No m'es dans
Si·ls autrui enfans
Colja el mieu berzol,
10 Qu'ieu sui grans.

The rendering of this difficult strophe I take to be somewhat as follows: 'she could never bring on herself greater shame when she dismissed me and took a dislike to me. And since she has wanted this, and it pleases my lady to exclude me from her service and to abandon me, it is no hurt to me if she lays the children of others in my cradle, for I am grown up.' Appel (*Beiträge*, I, p. 260) has shown that Stimming's rendering of *prendre en dols* ('in Schmerz versetzen') is untenable and must be replaced by 'Widerwillen gegen jemand bekommen', with the not unusual plural of the abstract noun instead of the singular, to which Levy (*Litblatt*, 1890, col. 232) had already pointed tentatively. Stimming (see note to his first edition, p. 233) is also mistaken in thinking that *que* ('than') is understood before *quan* in v. 2, as no comparison is instituted in this case.

In the last four verses the poet jilted by his lady gives vent to the bitterness of his feelings. Whatever she may do leaves him cold. Now that he is grown up and that he has learnt his lesson, she may rock the children of others in what was once his cradle when he was her child and did not know better.

33. 16-20

Per ja mais
Lo bobans
Remanha e·l mazans,
Qu'ieu o vuolh, s'ilh vol,
20 Dos aitans.

According to Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 16) *lo bobans* is the pomp of love and *mazan* the celebration of it: 'let the pomp (of love) cease for ever and its glorification, for if she wishes this, I wish it twice as much', i.e. I will no longer serve the lady and sing her praises in lofty words.

33. 21-30

Lo senher de cui es Manta
e Murols
S'es prims de terzols
Tornatz, ab que sai no rest.
25 Sieus seria, si·s n'anava
Lai Roais,
....
Alaps et Arans.
Puois feira filhol
30 Dels Persans.

The allusion is to Philippe-Auguste, lord of Mantes (Seine-et-Oise) and of Moreuil (Somme), who has turned out to be the best of the tercels or male falcons (the two others being Henry II and Frederic Barbarossa, Emperor of Germany), provided he does not remain behind but starts on the crusade.

In v. 27 I see no objection to retaining *Trevagans* (Tervagans) of all but one of the MSS., the name of a heathen deity often mentioned in the *chansons de geste*, especially in view of vv. 29-30, where it is said that if Philippe-Auguste goes on the crusade he will convert the paynim. The sudden intrusion of this god's name in the midst of a list of towns is certainly unexpected, but is no doubt attributable to the difficult metre. MS. C has *treuas e guans* (one syllable too many), which may hide the name of two other towns. A. Kolsen (op. cit., II, p. 136) would emend to *Pervagans* ('herumstreifend'), but *pervagar* is not attested, and moreover *Pervagan* would be required, which the rhyme does not allow.

In vv. 25-6 place a comma after *Lai* instead of after *anava*.

33. 38. Stimming³ reads (the verse is left blank in Appel, *Lieder*) *E Coras e Cans*. The MSS. have *El borc sanch amans* (C), *E coras e ganz* (IKd), *E carains e cantz* (M). As *Coras* cannot be identified, read *Eboras* (York), with Thomas, in lieu of *E Coras*.

33. 48. *E gortz e tirans*. For *gort* Thomas has 'engourdi', which does not suit the context; but, as *gourd* in Mistral shows, the word has also the meaning 'gras, bien nourri', which Stimming³ has rightly adopted. Appel's 'schwerfällig, widerwillig' can hardly be read into *gort*, I should say. *Tiran* cannot possibly signify 'blühend' (Stimming³) or 'prospère' (Thomas); the proper rendering is 'refractory', primarily of a horse which pulls on the reins. See *tirant* in Godefroy.

33. 51-60

Enaps e copas mazanta
 Et orzols
 D'argen e pairols
 E sec ribeiera e forest.
 55 E *si* tolia e donava,
 No·s bials
 Dels afans!
 Pressas e mazans,
 Guerra ab tribol
 60 L'es enans.

For *mazantar* see Appel (*Beiträge*, I, p. 261), who, however, makes no mention of Chabaneau's 'faire retentir' formed on *mazan* (*RLR.*, xxxi, p. 604), which, though unattested, agrees with the context much better than his 'in Unruhe, in Bewegung setzen'.

In v. 55 the sense seems to require Appel's emendation of *sai* (in all the MSS.) to *si*, the gist of the passage being, as he says: if he (Richard) took and gave (in war), he (Richard) should not now desist from war, for through war and its hardships alone shall he win pre-eminence. In v. 58 *mazan* should be rendered by 'Not, Muhsal' (*SW.*, v, p. 148 b), and not (as Appel, Stimming³ and Thomas) by its more usual meaning ('noise, turmoil').

Song 34. This piece preserved in MSS. IKd, all closely related, has come down to us in a very unsatisfactory state, with several blanks.

For the date see Appel, *Bertran von Born*, p. 57, note.

34. 1-8

Volontiers feira sirventes,
 S'om lo volgues auzir chantar,
 Que pretz es mortz, honors e bes;

 5 Tans n'i agra que mortz que pres
 Que, si...del mon no·i vengues,
 Tans no·n pogra aiga negar
 Ni tuit li fuoc del mon cremar!

The MSS. read *e sel pogues uenjar* (v. 4), or two syllables short. Stimming³ fills up the lacuna by turning *e sel* into *E si los* and prefixing *re-* to *venjar*. Thomas writes *E si·ls pogues nulz om venjar*, which flows more naturally. In v. 6 the MSS. have *que si sim del mon noi vengues*. Stimming and, following him, Thomas change *sim* to *fins* (*fis*). Andresen (*ZRPh.*, xviii, p. 269) attempts to prove, in vain I think, that *sim* or rather *sims*, merely another spelling for *cim*, can have the meaning 'end'. But if *cims* = *fins*, *fis* is not proven, might not *soms*, a very slight departure from the MSS. reading, have that value? In the next verse there is no good reason for not retaining the plural *aigas* of the MSS., which entails of course the change of *pogra* (= *pogrā*) to *pogran*.

34. 9-16

Si non es tortz ni nescies
 10 So qu'en chantan m'auzetx comtar?
 Quar Dieus dona la rend' e·l ces,
 (Qu'el s'en deu ja saber guidar),

Segon que l'om e l'avens es.
 Mas ses mesura non es res:
 15 Aïssel que·s vol desmesurar
 No pot sos fachs en aut poiar.

In v. 12 the MSS. show *quel son de ei* (d has *debia*) *saber guidar*, which Stimming³, with the change of *sen* to *sens*, interprets as *Que·l sens deiu saber guidar*. If the reading of Stimming³ is adhered to, it seems essential to emend *deia* to *deu ja*, as the subjunctive will not construe: 'and what you hear me tell in my song is not wrong or foolish; for God gives revenue and income, which the understanding ought indeed to know how to guide, according to the man and his property'; or, referring *que* to God, ... 'whom the understanding ought to know how to guide', etc. In neither case, however, can the version which results be said to give satisfaction. Much more probable is the reading (as above) suggested by Appel (*Beiträge*, I, p. 262), in which *el* refers to God and *se guidar* (SW., *guidar* 6) is taken in the sense of 'to behave' with a question mark after *comtar* (v. 10). Appel interprets the whole strophe as a retraction on Bernard's part (in v. 4 he reads *E s'i·ls* (= *E si eu los*) *pogues revenjar*, or *E si ieu los pogues venjar*) of what he had said in the previous strophe and as an acknowledgment of his *desmesura* in arrogating to himself the role of avenger of *pretz*, *honor e be* (v. 3), which belongs properly to God: 'ob das was Ihr mich sagen hört, nicht Unrecht und Torheit ist? Denn Gott gibt die Rente und den Zins, je nachdem der Mensch und sein Gut ist, denn er wird sich darin schon zu benehmen wissen.' While agreeing with Appel's emendation of Stimming's text, I cannot help thinking that he reads into the passage rather more than Bertran intended to say. I prefer to see in the whole piece nothing more than a general condemnation of those who, because of their lack of *mesura*, prove unworthy of the riches and power which God has bestowed upon them.

34. 17-18

Reiesme son, mas reis no·i es,
 E comtat, mais no coms ni bar.

The MSS. have *rei no ies* or *rei no jes* (= *ges*), which should be retained, and in the next line *contatz* (*comtat*) of I (K has *contaz* and d *contaez*) should also stand (it is here, as not infrequently, of the feminine gender); while *com* (the MSS. read *comt*) should be adopted on the model *coms*, *com*, *com*, *coms*, for which see Levy (*RLR.*, xxv-xxvi, p. 203): all four nouns (*bar* on the same model as *com*) are in the nominative plural, like those in the next three verses.

34. 28

Berartz ni Baudüis no·i par.

On Berard de Mondidier or Monleidier see the instructive note of Schultz-Gora (*Die Briefe des Troubadors Raimbaut de Vaqueiras*, p. 75),

and also Chabaneau-Anglade, *Onomastique des Troubadours*, p. 50, as well as the older work of Birch-Hirschfeld, *Über die den prov. Troub. bekannten epischen Stoffe*, pp. 71-3.

34. 29-32

E de pel penchenat son pro,
30 Rasas dens et en chais greno,
Mas no ges cel que sapch' amar,
Cort tener, domneiar ni dar.

In v. 30 between *e* and *cais* there is a gap in the MSS. of one syllable which Stimming fills by means of *en*, adopted by Appel. Appel, Stimming³ and Thomas render *grenon* by 'beard' instead of by 'moustache' and attribute to *cais* (*chais*) the meaning 'cheek', which it has sometimes, but which is not suitable in this context, as *grenon* shows. Taking *cais* in the well-attested sense of 'mouth' and *ras* as 'smooth, polished', the rendering is: 'of well combed (fops) there are plenty, with polished teeth, and with moustache on mouth (one might read *sul* in lieu of Stimming's *en*), but no man who understands the art of love, of holding court, of wooing and giving.' Appel (*Beiträge*, I, p. 263), who rejects Stimming's 'glatte Zähne' thinks that by *rasas dens* Bertran's intention is to convey that the upper lip covering the teeth was shaven and a strip of moustache left on the sides. His explanation seems very far-fetched and can hardly be right.

34. 33-40

Ai, flacha gen! On so·lh...
Que solon chastels assetjar,
35 E que solon setman' e mes
Cort mantener ab gen renhar,
E que solon donar rics dos
E far las autras messios
A soudadier et a joglar?
40 Un sol on vei? So aus comtar?

Andresen (*ZRPh.*, XVIII, p. 269) thinks that *tornes* of the MSS. should stand as the last word of the first verse, and that by *Tornes* or the 'men of Tours' Bertran is probably alluding to the Counts of Champagne who ruled for a long time also over Blois and Tours and were famed for their bravery and liberality. His suggestion, however, has not won approval and for lack of a better the emendation to *cortes*, in spite of its obviousness, can be accepted, provisionally at all events. *Renhar* (v. 36) should not be rendered by 'regiren' (Stimming¹) or by 'Herrschaft' (Stimming³), or by 'régner' (Thomas). It has here the more general and frequent meaning of 'to act, to behave' (*SW.*, VII, p. 231 b). Appel (*Bertran von Born*, p. 75) translates rightly *ab gen renhar* by 'mit schöner Sitte'; on the other hand Andresen (loc. cit.) with 'freundlich regierend' falls into the same error as Stimming and Thomas. In the last verse Appel (*Bei-*

träge, I, p. 263) wants to retain *on* (Stimming³ has *no·n*) of the MSS. and to take *auz* (the MSS. have *auz* or *autz*) as the second person sing. pres. ind. of *auzir* and in addition to place a question mark after *vei* as well as after *comtar*: 'wo sehe ich einen Einzigen? Hörst du das sagen?' This seems to me very forced. Why not understand *aus* or *auz* as the first person sing. pres. ind. of *auzar*, *ausar*? 'I do not see a single one, this I dare to say'; or (retaining *on* of the MSS.): 'where do I see a single one? This I dare to say.'

34. 45-47

45 Mas si Felips del mieu cor fos,
Richardz no mouria·ls talos
A son dan senes encontrar.

Encontrar, like Mod. French 'rencontrer' should be understood here in the sense 'se rencontrer les armes à la main': 'and if Philip were of my mind, Richard should not stir a foot to his (Philip's) hurt without a clash.' It would also be possible to understand a pronominal object (in this case *l'* referring to Philip) before *encontrar* (cp. Schultz-Gora, *Prov. Studien*, I, p. 74).

34. 49-50

Papiols, sias cochos:
50 Di·m en Richart qu'el es leos.

Stimming fills the blank (one syllable) before *cochos* by inserting *tan*, which Thomas accepts. Would not *en* (*cochos de*) be preferable? Best of all, however, is Appel's suggestion (*Beiträge*, I, p. 263): *Papiols, tu sias cochos*, on the model of 4. 57 (*Papiols, e tu vai viatz*). The appellation 'lion' applied to Richard is interesting. As for the epithet 'the Lion-Heart', we cannot say precisely when it came into general use; Ambroise used it within eight years after Richard's death: *Le preuz reis, le quor de lion* (*Estoire de la guerre sainte*, v. 2310).

Song 35. Contained in MSS. ADFIK.

The form of this piece is probably borrowed from a song attributed to Folquet de Marseille (cp. Appel, *Beiträge*, I, pp. 248-9). We may infer from v. 37, referring to Richard the Lion-Heart (*Puois vengutz es d'Alamanka*), that the present sirventes was written after he had returned from his captivity in Germany (March 1194).

35. 6-8

Sembla·s guarden d'ansessis,
Que ja lai on us d'els fos,
Non entreratz ses mesclanha!

When Bertran says of the barons of Limousin that it would seem that they are on their guard against assassins and you could not enter without a scuffle where one of them might be, I cannot help thinking that he had in mind more particularly the fanatical sect of the Assassins or 'eaters of hashish' (properly *hashshashiyun*), established among the

ranges of Lebanon, who, when under the influence of that intoxicating drug, were sent out by their chief, known as the Old Man of the Mountain, to murder his enemies. Two years only before the present sirventes was written (1194), the name of the Old Man of the Mountain had been on all men's lips; two of his emissaries had stabbed to death Conrad of Monferrat, just as he had been elected King of Jerusalem (28 April 1192); and in the late autumn of the same year news reached France that some of his followers had been despatched, at the instigation of Richard the Lion-Heart, so it was asserted, to compass the death of Philippe-Auguste. Philip appears to have taken the report seriously and for some time he did not appear in public unless surrounded by a special body guard armed with clubs. For a detailed account see A. Cartellieri, *op. cit.*, cxi, pp. 19-20.

35. 25-37

25 Be volgra · l reis fos devis
E que passes sai mest nos
E que saubes dels baros
Quais l'es fals ni quais l'es fis,
E conogues la malanha
30 De que clocha Lemozis,
Qu'era sieus e fora · lh bos,
Mas us sobros lo · lh gavanha.
Be volgra, l'en *marchausis*,
Coras qu'en fos lezeros,
35 E qu'en passes dos sedos,
Anz que trop li endurzis,
Puois vengutz es d'Alamanha.

The *crux* lies in *v.* 33. Of the five MSS. AD have *Ben uolgra len mas chausis*; IK *Ben uolgra len mas chausis*; F *Ben uolgra lom e si cruzis*. Stimming¹ adheres to the reading of AD; Stimming² and Stimming³ modify to *Ben volgra en ma · l chausis*. In all three editions Stimming interprets *en ma* ('in hand') as 'in his power': 'I would wish that he (Richard) saw it (Limousin) in his power.' But *cauzir en ma* in that sense is hardly possible and is rightly rejected by Levy (*SW.*, v, p. 77 a). Thomas emends to *Ben volgra lo mal chausis* ('I would wish that he (Richard) saw the evil'), which, while excellent in itself, has the drawback of repeating an idea already expressed in *v.* 29. Faced with these difficulties, Appel (*Beiträge*, II, pp. 33-4) has put forward a brilliant suggestion, which can be looked upon as final. He thinks that *Lemozis* here (*v.* 30) is not to be taken with Stimming and Thomas as the noun Limousin but as the adjective and that Bertran is likening the province of Limousin to a horse to which he gives the name of 'the one from Limousin' or the 'Limousiner'. The horse is limping and requires treatment by a veterinary surgeon who to cure him must pass two setons through the tumour before it gets too hard. In harmony with this simile,

Appel sees concealed in the various readings of the MSS. a verb, corresponding to OF. *mareschaucir*, formed from *marescal*, a veterinary surgeon. (Such a word would be likely to puzzle the scribes and accounts for the confused MSS. tradition.) He would accordingly read *Ben volgra l'en marchausis* ('I would wish that on that account he would treat him medically'); or, with the prefix *en-*, *l'enmarchausis* (... 'that he would hand him over to the veterinary surgeon'); or, as a third alternative, with transposition of the two syllables, *ben volgra.l maneschausis* (... 'that he would treat him medically').

In v. 34 Stimming³ renders *coras que* by 'wann auch immer', but the conjunction in this case is temporal and not concessive (Thomas has 'quand'), the subjunctive being due to the wish expressed in the principal clause. *Lezeros* in the same verse is also rendered incorrectly by 'in Musse befindlich'; the meaning is here 'qui a le loisir de' (Thomas), 'der Gelegenheit hat' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss.).

35. 38-40

E vuolh, n'Aimars, lo mesquis,
E'n Guis fassan partizos
40 Tan engals qu'us no s'en planha.

Aimar or Ademar was the younger and Gui the elder of the sons of Ademar V (1148-99), viscount of Limoges, Richard's old enemy. In the latter years of his father's life Gui assumed the title of viscount and shared the authority with his father, whom he succeeded in 1199. From what Bertran says, it would seem that Gui's brother, Ademar the younger, should have a share with his brother in the administration of the viscounty, for which there was a precedent, the two adopted sons of Ademar III, also called Gui and Ademar, having shared the power equally after their father's retirement in 1138 to the abbey of Cluny, till their death in 1148 when Ademar V succeeded them (cp. S. Stroński, *Légende*, pp. 185-6). It follows that Stimming's rendering of *mesqui* by 'Knauser' (both Thomas and Appel render the word correctly by 'young') requires correction as does also his note (p. 192) on Ademar.

35. 46-48

De que s'es mal menatz Guis
Ves me de doas preisos:
En amor et en companha.

This passage, passed over without any comment by Stimming and Thomas, and referring to some incident to which we have no clue, is unintelligible.

35. 49-53

Papiols, ja'n Frederis
50 No feira aital barganha
Com fetz sos filhs n'Aenris,
Quan pres romieus ab bordos,
Don pert Polha e Romanha.

In the last verse four of the five MSS. have *pres* which Stimming³, following Thomas, corrects to *pert* in order to avoid the repetition of *pres*. Despite that, the second *pres* should stand, or rather be replaced by *conges* of F (*Don conges Polh' e Romanha*). It is a well known historical fact that the huge sum which Henry VI, Emperor of Germany, exacted as Richard's ransom was utilized in great part to raise the large army with which he conquered southern Italy (*Apulia and Romagna*) and Sicily in 1194 (cp. Theodor Toeche, *Kaiser Heinrich VI*, Leipzig, 1867, p. 331). This same fact is alluded to pointedly by Peire Vidal in vv. 19-22 of *Bon' aventura don Dieus als Pisans* (ed. Anglade², p. 116):

E si m creira Richartz, reis dels Engles,
En breu d'ora tornara per sas mans
Lo regisme de Palerm' e de Riza,
Car lo conquis la soa rezensos.

Song 36. Contained in MSS. ADIK.

Written when the news reached Bertran that Richard the Lion-Heart was coming from England to France after his captivity in Germany, which he did in May, 1194.

36. 13 Quan nostre reis poira mest nos atendre.

I venture to think that *atendre* is here used in the second sense indicated by the *Donat Prov.* (ed. Stengel, p. 35): '*expectare vel promissum solvere*'. The examples listed by Raynouard and Appel (*Chrest.*⁶, p. 214), it is true, all show that *atendre* with that value is followed by an accusative of the thing fulfilled; but the following instance from Pistoleta (ed. Niestroy, p. 60) leads to the conclusion that *atendre* in the sense of 'to fulfil a promise' could be used without an object: *E·m trobes om leial totas sasos, Larc e meten, prometen ab atendre*. An easier way of course would be to assume that *poira* of the MSS. stands for *poirē=poirem*, as Appel (*Beitridge*, II, p. 35) suggests, which entails of course the change of *reis* to *rei*.

36. 25 No·m platz companha de basclos.

Basclo, properly 'Basques', as Thomas (p. 94) points out, was one of the names given in the Middle Ages to the 'routiers' or 'freebooters' (Appel, *Lieder*, Gloss., renders correctly by 'Freibeuter'). Cp. Du Cange under *Baschi*: 'Baschi et ruptarii qui populum et terram vastabant.' Thus Stimming's 'Wegelagerer', 'Strauchdieb', requires correction.

36. 31-32 En domn' escharsa no·s deuria om entendre
Que per aver pot pleiar et estendre.

The first verse offers the only example in Bertran de Born of the epic caesura, and even in this case it is by no means certain as the MSS. are

few and not very reliable (cp. Thomas, *Romania*, xxii, p. 593). For the epic caesura in the troubadour lyric generally, see Schultz-Gora, *Prov. Studien*, II, p. 132 and my article, written many years ago by a tiro, in *Mod. Lang. Quart.*, Dec. 1903, pp. 119-22. In the second verse *pleiar* and *estendre* are not to be understood figuratively with Stimming and Thomas (of whom the latter renders *pleiar* by 'trionpher' and omits *estendre*), but literally with Chabaneau (*RLR.*, xxxi, p. 604), the meaning being, as he says: 'dont on peut, pour de l'argent, faire ce qu'on veut.'

Song 37. Contained in MS. M.

On the date of this piece see my article in *Romania*, LVII, pp. 487 ff.

37. 1-8 Mieî-sirventes vuolh far dels reis amdos,
 Qu'en brieu veirem qu'aura mais chavaliers:
 Del valen rei de Castela, n'Anfos,
 Qu'auch dir que ve e volra soudadiers;
 5 Richartz metra a muois et a sestiers
 Aur et argen, e te's a benananza
 Metr' e donar e no vol s'afiansa,
 Anz vol guerra mais que qualha esparviers.

According to Stimming¹ (pp. 272-3) Bertran intended to say: 'we shall see who will have more knights "*del valen rei. . . o de Richart*",' but, balked by the long relative clause, he began a new period with *Richartz metra. . . Anglade* (*Anthologie*, p. 65) apparently takes the same view: 'et nous verrons bientôt qui aura plus de chevaliers, du vaillant roi de Castille, Alphonse (car j'entends dire qu'il vient et qu'il voudra des soldats), ou de Richard; Richard dépensera par muids et par setiers or et argent', etc. A simpler way is (b) to omit the colon or comma (Stimming³ and Appel, *Chrest.*⁶, p. 106 have a comma) after *chavaliers* and to take *de* = 'than': 'for soon we shall see who (i.e. Richard) will have more knights than the valiant king of Castile, lord Alphonso, for I hear that he (Richard) is coming and will want hirelings' (not 'soldiers', as Anglade). Best of all, however, is (c) to retain the colon or comma after *chavaliers* and to construe, following a well-known construction: 'for I hear concerning the valiant king of Castile, lord Alphonso, that he is coming, i.e. for I hear that the valiant king of Castile', etc. In all three editions Stimming reads *e no vol sa fianza* (v. 7) and renders *fianza* by 'Sicherheit', a possible rendering (cp. *SW.*, III, p. 496) of the word: 'and he (Richard) does not want his security (i.e. that one should offer him security), but he desires war more eagerly than a hawk desires a quail.' Thomas adopts the same reading as Stimming, but translates *fianza* by 'trêve', for which there is no warrant. Levy (*SW.*, I, p. 26 a and III, p. 496 a) rejects Stimming's reading in favour of *e no vol s'afiansa*, and renders *afiansa* by 'Vertrag', to which he adheres in *PD*. ('traité'): 'and he (Richard) does

not want his (Alphonso's) treaty, i.e. any treaty with Alphonso.' In all editions of his *Chrestomathie* Appel also writes *e no vol s'afianza* and renders *afianza*, as he does in *Lieder* (Gloss.), by 'Sicherstellung', in which case his *e no vol s'afianza* is equivalent to Stimming's *e no vol sa fianza*. Though the meaning ('Sicherstellung') ascribed by Appel to *afianza* is just possible (*PD.*, however, has 'traité' only for *afianza* and 'garantir, se porter garant' for *afizansar*), I am on the whole inclined to write *e no vol sa fianza*, with *fianza* in the well-attested meaning of 'oath' or 'plighted word', as, for example, in these verses of a *tenso* between Albert, marquis of Malaspina and Raïmbaut de Vaqueiras (Appel, *Chrest.*⁶, p. 128): *Enves totz cels c'ab vos an acordansa E que·us servon de grat e volontier, Vos non tenetz sagramen ni fianza*, in which *sagramen* and *fianza* are equivalent. If, however, *s'afianza* is preferred (the repetition of *fianza* at the rhyme in v. 25 has no importance), I would also take it, on the analogy of OF. *afiance*, in the sense of 'oath, plighted word', with *s' = sa*, referring to Alphonso, or with *s'* as an ethic dative, referring to Richard.

37. 23

Ni merchadiers que venha de ves Franza.

In his Glossary Stimming³ writes *deves* in one word and renders it by 'nachhin', as does also *SW.*, II, p. 195 b; and Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) by 'Richtung wohin'. *Deves*, 'du côté de', however, according to the context, can designate either the place 'from which' (cp. 16. 18) or 'to which'; here the former obviously, as for example in B. de Ventadorn's *Can la frej' aura venta Deves vostre país*.

Song 38. Contained in MSS. IKd.

There are no means of ascribing even an approximate date to this piece.

38. 7. *Confratre*: Stimming³ renders the word by 'Mönch', which is queried by Levy in *PD.* Thomas' 'confrère' does not seem to suit the context. Appel's 'Klosterbruder' is probably the meaning.

38. 8-9

Non i es us, no·l poschatz tondr'e raire
O ses congrenh's dels quatre pes ferrar!

Chabaneau (*RLR.*, xxxii, p. 208) draws attention to the fact that Raynouard's 'travail, instrument de maréchal, avec lequel on tient les chevaux suspendus' (*LR.*, II, p. 458), queried by Thomas, is the right meaning of *congrenh* and that it is confirmed by the Catalan *congreny*. Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 37) amplifies his indication and quotes from Laberna's dictionary: *congreny de manescal*: 'maquina de fusta pera subjectar las cavalcaduras que non volon dexarse ferrar o curar'.

38. 18. *Chalonjar*: not 'herausfordern' here as Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.), or Stimming³; but rather, with Thomas, 'réclamation, résistance'.

Song 39. Contained in MSS. CM (in M vv. 17-24 and 41-44 are lacking).

39. 1-6
 Bel m'es, quan vei chamjar lo senhoratge,
 Que ·lh vielh laissan als joves lor maisos,
 E chascus pot laissar a son linhatge
 Tans filhs que l'us puoso esser pros.
 5 Adoncs m'es vis que ·l segles renovel
 Mielhs que per flor ni per chantar d'auzel.

In v. 3 Stimming³ and also Crescini (*Manuale*³, p. 197) have chosen the version of C (*E chascus pot giquir a son linhatge*); but, as Appel points out (*Beiträge*, II, p. 61), it is hardly possible to assign to *giquir* the value of *laisser* and consequently the reading *laisser en* of the other MS., adopted by Thomas, is the right one. In lieu of *segles renovel* (v. 5) I suggest *segle·s renovel*, another case of the dropping of final *s* so as to permit enclisis (cp. note to 17. 38), which has the advantage, by making *renovelar* reflexive, of balancing *be·s deu renovelar* of v. 8.

39. 9-16
 10 Per vielha tenh domna.....,
 Et es vielha, quan chavalier non a.
 Vielha la tenh.....
 Et es vielha, quant avols hom lo·lh fa.
 Vielha la tenh, si ama dintz son chastel,
 Et es vielha, quan l'a ops de fachel.
 15 Vielha la tenh, puois l'enoian joglar,
 Et es vielha, quan trop vuolha parlar.

In the first verse C reads *Vielha la tenc dona pus capelaia*, and M *Per vielha tenc dona ma capelaia*. Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 62) reviews the various attempts (Tobler, Levy, Thomas, Stimming, Crescini) to explain this obscure verse. He rejects them all as unsatisfactory and submits tentatively a further conjecture, based on M, according to which the *p* in *ma capelaia* may be a faulty reading of the *r* with a tail found in some MSS. If so, *ma capelaia* would stand for *macarelatge*, corresponding to French 'macarelage', which would give *Per vielha tenc domn' a macarelatge*: I regard as old 'eine Frau die sich verkuppeln lässt', or, 'die (selbst) verkuppelt'. This hypothesis seems to me even less attractive than the others rejected by Appel and suits the context no better. Can it be that *pus capelaia* of C hides an original *pus que per l'atge*? 'as old I regard a lady more than on account of her age: she is old when she has no knight', etc. From a general statement of the kind the specific reasons for which Bertran holds a woman to be no longer young and which he enumerates in the rest of the strophe would flow naturally and be more appropriate as a starting point than any of the explanations put

forward hitherto, including that of Levy (*SW.*, I, p. 205) adopted by Stimming³, in which *pelatge* = 'Ausfallen der Haare, Haarschwund' is very doubtful, and which is also very improbable on general grounds. But, to revert to my suggestion, is it permissible to admit a form *atge* in Bertran's time? Raynouard (*LR.*, III, p. 235), it is true, quotes one example of the word, and Levy (*SW.*, I, pp. 96-7) two, but all three are from prose writings and rather late.

In the second hemistich of v. 11 *si de dos drutz s'apaya* (adopted by Thomas, Stimming³ and Crescini) is certainly preferable to *pos de sos drutz si paya* of the other MS.; but to render *s'apayar* by 'se contenter de' (Thomas) or 'sich befriedigen mit' (Stimming³ and Appel) would suggest the opposite of what Bertran intends to convey; his meaning is that the lady is contemptible who requires more than one lover to appease her passion. It was considered bad form for a married woman to have more than one lover. The same idea is expressed by B. Marti, one of the early troubadours (ed. Hoepffner, p. 9):

Mas ab son marit l'autrei
Un amic cortes prezant.
E si plus n'i vai sercant,
Es desleialada
E puta provada.

The meaning of *si ama* (read *s'ama*, so as not to exceed the required number of syllables) *dintz son chastel* (v. 13) is uncertain. The most likely explanation, I should say, is that of Chabaneau (*RLR.*, XXXII, p. 207) who asks: 'faut-il entendre: si c'est son mari qu'elle aime?' In knightly circles it was also considered not to be the proper thing for a lady to be too much in love with her husband and equally bourgeois for a husband to pay undue attention to his own wife, as we know from the Monk of Montaudon's *Enueg*:

E tenc dona per enoiosa,
Quant es paubre et orgoillosa,
E marit qu'ama trop sa sposa.

In the second hemistich of v. 14 (in M only, in the form *ma lha ops de fachel*) *fachel*, not attested elsewhere, which Stimming³ renders by 'Zauber mittel' (Appel has the same rendering, but with a query) and Thomas by 'sortilège', as well as the construction *ops aver ad alcu de alcuna re*, are queried by Levy (*SW.*, III, p. 369). *Fachilha* ('charm, spell'), *fachilhar* ('to bewitch') are attested and there is nothing inherently impossible in a form *fachel*. Can the meaning be (reading *quan l'es ops de fachel*): 'when she has recourse to soothsayeres and sorcerers?'

The only MS. (C) which has this strophe writes *joues domna*, which should stand and be read as *jov'es domna*, the flexional *s* falling so as to permit elision. Stimming³ and Appel (as above) intercalate unnecessarily *es* between *joves* and *domna*, and by so doing attributes to Bertran de Born a decasyllabic verse with epic cesura, a very doubtful proceeding. Cp. note to 36. 31.

39. 20 E ves bo pretz avol mestier non a.

The meaning is well rendered by Crescini's: 'verso buon pregio, per ottener fama non ha, non adopera fiacco ministero' (*Manuale*³, p. 417) (cp. *SW.*, *mestier* 2).

39. 23-24 Joves si te, quan no·i chal divinar,
Qu'ab bel joven si gart de mal estar.

For *divinar* Stimming³ has 'verläumden', 'klatschen'; Crescini 'tirar a indovinare', 'spiare'; *PD.* 'faire, émettre des conjectures sur les amours d'autrui'; Appel 'spionieren und (darüber) klatschen' (*Lieder*, Gloss.), which is the nearest equivalent. Thomas puts no comma after *divinar* and translates it by 'deviner'. By so doing he has apparently induced Anglade (op. cit., p. 61) to give a translation which is certainly wrong: 'elle se maintient jeune quand il n'est pas nécessaire de deviner qu'elle doit se garder de se conduire mal avec un beau jeune homme.' Taking *que* as conditional and hypothetical (hence the subjunctive) I would render: 'she keeps herself young, when she is indifferent to scandal-mongering, when, with 'bel joven', she is careful not to do anything unseemly'.

39. 27 Per jove·l tenh quan pro·lh costan ostatge.

For *ostatge*, omitted from Thomas' Glossary, Stimming³ gives 'Geissel, Bürgschaft', which Levy (*SW.*, v, p. 543 a) corrects to 'Bewirthung', adopted by Appel, in agreement with Crescini (*Manuale*³, p. 425): 'L' ostaggio è ospite (nel lat. medievale *hostaticus* da *hospitaticus*: Du Cange, s. *Hostagium*): e significava cavalleresca giovanilità il trattar largamente qualsiasi maniera di ospiti. Cfr. invece l'antitesi dei vv. 35-6.'

39. 29 Joves, quan art s'archa ni son vaissel.

Thomas renders *vaissel* by 'vase', Stimming³ by 'Gefäss', and Crescini by 'vasello'. The following verse from a piece of Raimon d'Avinho: *e sai far arcas e vaissels* (Bartsch, *Chrest.*⁶, 230, 21) tends to show that *arca* and *vaissel* are here synonymous and that Appel's rendering ('verbrennt er Koffer and Kasten': *Bertran von Born*, p. 78, note) should be adopted, though in the Glossary to *Lieder* he translates *vaissel* by 'Gefäss, Fass':

the man who is 'young' burns chest and coffer because he spends his money instead of storing it.

39. 31 Per jove·l tenh, quan ben vuolha jogar.

It was part of the education of a young knight to learn chess and drafts and games of chance such as backgammon, and to play for high stakes if he wished to be considered 'young' and to belong to the right set. To show what a wonderful youth Beton was, the author of *Daurel et Beton* (vv. 1275 ff.) says:

Pueja(s) cavals et a los abrivatz,
Fon bels parliers e gen enrazonatz,
Joga a taulas, ad escax et a datz,
Et en la cort fo fort per totz amatz.

39. 33-34 Vielhs es rics om, quan re no met en gatge
E li sobra blatz e vis e bacos.

Sobrar can be interpreted in the sense either of 'être de reste' (Thomas), 'sopravanzare' (Crescini), or of 'im Überfluss (Überrmass) vorhanden sein' (Stimming³ and Appel), but there is no need to attribute, as Stimming³ does (p. 211), concessive forces to *E*.

40. 40 E vielhs, quan pot gandr ses baratar.

Appel (*Beiträge*, II, p. 46) thinks that the meaning of *baratar* here is in all probability 'verpfänden, versetzen, Schulden machen', and not 'to win' as Thomas and Stimming³ and Crescini: 'and old (is he), when he can get away without pledging something of his belongings', i.e. if he can manage to tear himself away from the game without pledging anything (which would give him the opportunity of showing his knightly qualities). The only objection is that the same idea is already expressed in v. 33 (see above). *Gandir* stands for *se gandr* (cp. note to 16. 8).

39. 41-44 Mo sirventesc port de vielh e novel
Arnautz joglars a Richart, que·l chapdel;
E ja tesar vielh no vuolh' amassar,
Qu'ab tesar jove pot pretz gazanhar!

To write with Stimming³ *port* (with an apostrophe) *e vielh e novel* is unnecessary; the subjunctive (*port*) is equally satisfactory. Instead of *mo sirventesc port e vielh e novel* of C, the only MS. which has the *tornada*, it is very tempting to adopt, with Crescini (op. cit., p. 198 and Appel, as above), the slight emendation proposed by Tobler: *mo sirventesc port de vielh e novel*. Kolsen's conjecture (*Litblatt*, 1919, col. 392) to the effect that not only *port* but also *vielh* and *novel* are present subjunctives (the first from *velhar* and the second from an unattested *novelhar*, 'to relate') may be summarily dismissed. In the last verse Thomas inverts *jove* and

pot (perhaps to avoid the Italian caesura, of which, however, there are several certain examples in Bertran de Born); but the intended contrast between *tezaur vielh* (the treasure which remains unused and thus becomes old and rusty) and *tezaur jove* (the treasure freely spent) should not be tampered with.

III. SONGS OF DOUBTFUL ATTRIBUTION

Song 40. Contained in MSS. ABCDIKMPSgTUVa¹de. Attributed in IKTa¹d only to Bertran de Born; in ABD to Guilhem de Saint Gregori; in C to Lanfranc Cigala; in M to Guillem Augier; in PUV to Blacasset; in Sg to Pons de Capduelh.

Much has been written concerning the authorship of this famous piece. The question was last discussed by Lewent (*ASNS.*, cxxx, pp. 325 ff.), who ascribes it to Guilhem de Saint Gregori; but Appel (*ibid.*, cxlvii, pp. 220 ff.) has demonstrated that the arguments put forward by Lewent are not decisive. It almost looks as if the problem were unsolvable, though the odds are, I think, in favour of Bertran de Born.

40. 6. *Quan vei sobrels pratz: per los pratz*, with Thomas and Crescini, is more strongly supported by the MSS. than the reading of Appel and Stimming³.

40. 11-12

E platz mi, quan li corredor
Fan las gens e l'aver fugir.

Aver here should be rendered by 'Herde' with Appel. Stimming³ has only 'Habe, Geld', and Thomas 'avoir, argent'. *PD.*, however, puts down 'troupeau, bestiaux' among the various meanings of the noun *aver*.

40. 15. *E platz mi en mon coratge*: this gives one syllable too much. Crescini (op. cit., p. 195) writes correctly *m'en*.

40. 41-48

Ie·us die que tan no m'a sabor
Manjar ni beure ni dormir
Com a, quan auch cridar: 'A lor!'
D'ambas las partz et auch ennir
45 Chavals vochs per l'ombratge,
Et auch cridar: 'Aidatz! Aidatz!'
E vei chazer per los fossatz
Paus e grans per l'erbatge.

If in v. 43 one writes *com a* (MS. a¹ has *con fai*), as above, with Thomas and Stimming³, instead of *coma*, *sabor* is understood after *a*. In the same verse one might at first sight be induced to render *A lor!*, on the model of French 'à moi', by 'help!', but any such idea is dispelled by *Aidatz!* of v. 46. *A lor!* is to be rendered by 'At them!' I cannot quote another Provençal example of this use of *a* with the dative of the pronoun, but

the following passage from *La Queste del Saint Graal* (ed. Pauphilet, p. 87), to which my friend John Orr has drawn my attention, offers an interesting OF. parallel: *Et lors a il encontre jusqu'a vint homes armez... Et quant il le voient, si li demandent dont il est. Et il dist qu'il est de la meson le roi Artus; et il s'escrient tuit ensemble. Or a lui! Et quant il voit ce, si s'apareille de deffendre au mieiz qu'il puet.*

With regard to *ombratge* (v. 45), which Appel and Stimming³ render by 'Schatten', Levy (*SW.*, v, p. 480 b) says the meaning of the word here is not clear to him. The primary significance of *ombratge*, like French *ombrage*, is 'réunion d'arbres, de branches, de feuilles qui donnent de l'ombre' (Littré), as in Marcabrun's *M'es bel dous chan per l'ombratge* (iv, p. 369), or in Marot's *Un cler ruisseau bruyant près de l'ombrage*. From this is derived by analogy the meaning 'absence de lumière, obscurcissement'. The concrete rather than the derived value of the word (in the latter case the author would hardly have used the preposition *per*) should I think be assigned to *ombratge* in this passage, in agreement with Diez's 'aus des Waldes Schatten' (op. cit., p. 156): 'and I hear the riderless horses neighing in the shadow of the wood.' We must assume that the combat is taking place near a wood and that the horses, bereft of their masters and terrified by the din of battle, have fled there for shelter.

40. 51-53

Baro, metetz en gatge
Chastels e vilas e ciutatz
Enanz qu'usquecs no us guerreiatz!

The correct rendering of this *tornada* is that given by Thomas: 'Barons, engagez villes, châteaux et cités, plutôt que de ne pas vous faire la guerre les uns aux autres.' That of Anglade (op. cit., p. 64) is unacceptable as is also Stimming's translation of *villa* who thinks that the word here = *vilâ* ('Bauer'). Appel omits the word from his Glossary.

Song 41. Contained in MS. M.

This *sirventes* presents the same metrical structure and the same rhymes as the next piece (*Er ai ieu tendut mon trabuc*), which is also found in MS. M only. Even some of the rhyme-words (*vos, bos, garcos, cochos, assalha, säuc*) are indentical. One is almost certainly imitated from the other. In the MS. the present piece is attributed to Bertran de Born and the next to 'Lantelmet del Aghillon', who is otherwise unknown. According to Chabaneau (*RLR.*, xxv-xxvi, pp. 231-2) there has been confusion on the part of the scribe who inverted the roles and ascribed the work of the master to the imitator and *vice-versa*. It cannot be denied that No. 41 *a* bears a striking resemblance in form and spirit with some of Bertran's political songs, particularly *Un sirventes on motz non falk*; and

it may well be that he is the author. On the other hand, there does not appear to be any valid reason for attributing the present sirventes to the somewhat shadowy 'Lantelmet del Aghillon' rather than to Bertran de Born, the more so as several leaves intervene between the two pieces in the MS. and transposition under those circumstances is hard to admit. If, however, the Raimon de Planel mentioned in v. 43 is the same person as the man of that name attested in 1233 and 1243 (cp. Stimming³, p. 290), this would seem to militate against Bertran as the author of No. 41.

41. 1-7

Mailoli, joglar malastruc,
 Puous acoindat m'a om de vos
 E mi venetz querre chanzos,
 En talan ai qu'ie·us en valha.
 5 Quar etz avols e semblatz bos,
 Mielhs fora, fossetz champios
 Que viure d'autrui curalha.

In v. 1 read *Maioli*, from Maiolinus, a diminutive of Majolus, with Andresen (*ZFSL.*, XLII, p. 40). In the next verse Thomas, Stimming³, and Appel, all accept *acoindat*, as suggested by Tobler, in lieu of a *comdat* of the only MS. Possibly the original read: *puous qe comdat (comtat) ma hom de uos*: 'since people have told me about you.' Andresen (*ZRPh.*, XIV, p. 214) was the first to propose *curalha*, corresponding to OF. *curaille* ('offal, leavings'), instead of *coralha* of the MS. His emendation, adopted by Stimming³ and by Appel, does not appear to me to be indispensable, the more so as there is no indication in the piece that Maioli lives on other people's leavings. Bertran's intention is rather to contrast Maioli's lack of pluck, amplified in the other strophes, with the 'courage' (*coralha*) of the *campio* or professional fighter, who hired himself out to fight the battles of others. The fact that *coralha* occurs again (v. 18) at the rhyme cannot be alleged as a serious objection to its retention here, since numerous instances of such repetition are found throughout Bertran's poems (cp. note to 14. 28).

41. 8-9

Aital solatz m'avetz faissuc
 Qu'autr' om en seria enoios.

Enoios is to be taken here in the sense of 'vexed', which Levy (*SW.*, III, p. 15 a) and Appel (*Lieder*, Gloss.) query: 'your company is so tedious to me that another man would be annoyed thereat.'

41. 22-25

Dedintz etz plus chaus d'un sauc
 Et a maior cor us soiros,
 Mas lo fetges e lo polmos
 25 Es grans sotz la chabessalha.

In v. 25 *Ez as* = *Et a·s* (with ethic dative) of the MS. should be retained. For *chabessalha* Stimming's 'Kapuze, Kopfbedeckung' and Thomas

'capuchon' are unsuitable, as Bertran has in view a garment covering the liver and the lungs. Appel renders the word by 'eine Art Kragen-mantel', which the examples of OF. *cheveçaille* do not bear out (cp. Tobler-Lommatzsch, *Altfranz. Wörterbuch*).

Song 41 a. Contained in MS. M.

41 a. 18-21. After upbraiding a certain baron for shutting his eyes to his enemies and being treacherous to his friends, Bertran adds ironically:

E per tan no tem far falha,
Qu'el ditz (e no·n es vergonhos)
20 Que sos parentz fo Ganelhos;
Per o non chal q'el trasalha.

There can be no doubt I think that *trasalhir*, 'to transgress', should be taken here in the sense of *forlinhar*, OF. *forlignier*, 'dégénérer de la vertu de ses ancêtres' (Godefroy): 'and on that account I do not fear to go wrong, for he says (and he is not ashamed of it) that his ancestor was Ganelon; wherefore there is no need for him to be untrue to his stock.'

Song 42. Contained in MSS. DE. Attributed in D to 'Willems e n'Aimerics' and in E to 'Aimeric de Belenuei'. S. Stroński (*Folquet de Marseille*, pp. 55-8) gives good reasons for believing that Bertran is the author.

42. 49-51

Mas a cel en soi grazire
50 Qui per nostra mort aucire
Denhet esser en crotz mortz.

With v. 50 may be compared:

Cossi Dieus per nos a guerir
Receup mort e pus mort aucis.
(P. d'Alvernia, ed. Zenker, p. 127.)
Qu'il receup mort per mort aucir.
(G. Figueira, ed. Levy, p. 73.)
Et ab sa mort la nostra mort aucis.
(B. d'Auriac, *Choix*, iv, p. 469.)

Song 43. Contained in MSS. Ta, c. Attributed in T to Bertran de Born, in a to Ricart de Berbeziu, and in c to Peire Vidal.

On the question of the authorship, see S. Stroński, *Folquet de Marseille*, 1910, p. xii (Peire Vidal); G. Bertoni, *Annales du Midi*, xxiii, 1911, pp. 204 ff. (R. de Barbezieux); A. Kolsen, *ZRPh.*, xli, 1921, pp. 538 ff. (Raimon Vidal); P. Rajna, *Romania*, L, 1924, pp. 259 ff. (Arnaut Daniel).

43. 4. *Sembleran tot leugier*: Thomas reads *tuit legier*, and the evidence of the MSS. (T has *tut* and a *tuit*) is in his favour.

43. 9-14

Dolen e trist e ple de marrimen
10 Son remasut li cortez soudadier
E·lh trobador e·lh joglar avinen.
Trop an agut en Mort mortal guerrier!
Que tout lor a lo jove rei engles,
Ves cui eran li plus larc cobeitos.

In the second verse the epithet *cortes* shows that *soudadier* must not be rendered by 'soldats', with Thomas, Audiau (op. cit., p. 214) and Anglade (op. cit., p. 67). The term *soudadier* was applied very widely to all those who received pay for their services, including those about the court. In v. 13 *que* could also be taken as the relative pronoun, in which case the exclamation mark after *guerrier* would of course have to be deleted.

43. 17 Estenta Mortz, plena de marrimen.

Of the three MSS. T reads *senta* and the two others *estenta*. The different interpretations of *estenta* are discussed by Levy (*SW.*, III, p. 318) and by Stimming³ (pp. 166-7). To these may be added that of A. Kolsen (*ZRP.*, XLI, p. 540, note) who surmises, on the analogy of *extendi, se latius extentare*, that *extentus* and Provençal *estent*, somewhat like *inflatus*, could assume the meaning 'proud', 'arrogant'. It cannot be said that any of the attempts hitherto made to explain this puzzling word carry conviction, and there appears to be no other choice than to adopt with Thomas *estouta*, first proposed by Suchier many years ago.

43. 25-28 25 D'aquest segle fiau, ple de marrimen,
S'amors s'en vai, son joi tenh menzongier,
Que re no·i a que no torn en cozen.
Totz jorns veuzis, e val mens uoi que ier.

Both Anglade (op. cit., p. 67) and Audiau (op. cit., p. 214) render the two first verses as follows: 'Si amour quitte ce monde lâche et plein d'amertumes, je tiens sa joie pour mensongère, car tout s'y tourne en douleur cuisante.' I venture to think they are in error; s', I take it, is the possessive used, as is often the case in Provençal and other Romance tongues, pleonastically (cp. 5. 51-2) with the genitive *d'aquest segle*: 'the love of this feeble world, full of sorrow, is departing, its joy I hold as deceitful, for there is nothing in it but turns to burning pain.' As for *veuzis* (v. 28), Schultz-Gora (*Deutsche Litztg.*, 1914, col. 2082) has made it clear that the derivation from *vilis* is the right one and that the word has no connexion with *viduus*, as Stimming³ (p. 167) thinks. It follows that the correct rendering is 'avilir' (*PD.*), 'devenir vil' (Thomas) 'gemein werden' (*Lieder*, Gloss.), and that Stimming's 'veröden' is to be rejected (cp. *Donat Prov.*, 37 b, 44: *vellzir*, 'vilescere'). In this connexion it is worth noticing that, of the three MSS., c is the only one which has *veuzis* (*ueuqis*). The other two (T and a) read *ueiretz ce* and *ueiretz qe* respectively; and it may well be that this is the original reading, the more so as *veuzis* expresses much the same idea as the second hemistich of the verse.

43. 31 Ar'es anatz sos gens cors amors.

There is no need to read *Ar'* (with an apostrophe), as *ar* is equivalent to *ara*.

43. 33-34

Celui que plac pel nostre marrimen
Venir el mon nos traire d'encombrier.

A good example, not noted by Stimming³ or Thomas, of the pronominal adverb *que*, on which see the exhaustive note by S. Stroński, *Folquet de Marseille*, pp. 229 ff., standing in this case for the dative. MS. a has the more normal *cui*.

(concluded)

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

THE INDEX OF THE VERNON MANUSCRIPT

It is nearly a century since Halliwell published, in a limited edition, a small pamphlet with the title *Some Account of the Vernon Manuscript* (London, J. R. Smith, 1848). This gave a brief description of the volume and a very incomplete list of the contents, many pieces being omitted altogether, and many separate items telescoped together under one heading. Since then, one treasure after another in this 'vast massy manuscript' (as Bernard's *Catalogue* describes it) has been discovered, but a complete list of all the items contained in it has never been published. Fortunately there is a fairly complete index in the volume itself, which needs only a few additions and little correction. This is now printed in full, with bibliographical notes on each item.

The suggestion of an edition of this index was made to me by Miss Hope Allen, and through her kind offices I have had the use of a set of rotographs of the Index, supplied by the American Council of Learned Societies. I am most grateful to the Council and to Miss Allen herself. The late Professor Samuel Moore made a further suggestion, on which I have acted: That the Index to Vernon might represent a dialect which would be a better guide to the place of compilation than the dialect of the text itself, liable as each of the items was to be influenced by the characteristics of its original version. An analysis of the dialect of the Index will be found below, and I will only say here, that it seems to me, so far as our knowledge goes at present, to belong to the South Shropshire—South Staffordshire area. In a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement*, 8 February 1936, on some manuscripts of the *Ancren Riwle*, Miss Allen gives reasons for connecting the Vernon MS. with Staffordshire, and particularly with Lichfield, the evidence consisting in contemporary notes in the manuscript itself and in its sister manuscript, the Simeon. This is certainly supported by the linguistic evidence. I should add that the general impression given by the dialect of the text is much the same as that of the Index. I am hoping to finish before long an examination of the dialect of the whole of Vernon, and of the Simeon MS.

Mr J. A. Herbert dates the Vernon MS. between 1380 and 1400. The Index, he informs me, is a very little later than the rest of the volume, being of the early fifteenth century. The hand in which the index is written does not occur in Simeon, though the copyist who wrote the whole of the Vernon text is the same as one of those responsible for Simeon. This information also I owe to Mr Herbert.

The pages of Vernon measure $15\frac{1}{2} \times 22\frac{1}{2}$ in. The whole volume weighs $48\frac{3}{4}$ lbs. Each page is carefully ruled into eighty lines. The headings and most of the capitals are in red, and many of the initial letters at the beginning of items are large and elaborately coloured. In addition, a number of the pages have coloured designs—mostly conventionalized flower designs. There are several miniatures, illustrating individual items; I have mentioned these in the notes on the items concerned. Originally the manuscript contained 413 folios (parchment), of which 69 have been unfortunately lost; the positions of the lost pages are also indicated in the notes. The largest group is in the *Miracles of the Virgin*, where 40 leaves have been cut out.

The contemporary foliation is in red Roman figures in the upper left-hand corner of the verso of each leaf; I have kept to this numbering, so that a folio-number refers to the left and right hand pages of the open book; I have used the letters A and B to refer to these, 10 A, for instance, being the left, 10 B the right-hand page. After f. 401 A there are no more red numbers, and from here to the end I have followed the ink numbers written at the right-hand top corner of the recto of the folio, calling them 402 r., 402 v., etc., in the more usual modern fashion.

Before the volume was foliated or indexed, four leaves (336 B–340 A) were interchanged with four others (368 B–372 A). The mistake as to position was rectified after foliation and after indexing, but before binding, so that now the text runs on correctly, but the folio numbers and the Index are both wrong. Fortunately only a few titles in the Index (including that of the *Ancren Riwle*) are affected, and I have restored them to their proper places, printing them in italics. (See the notes to items 359, 361, 362, 371.) Similarly ff. 282 B–283 A and ff. 275 B–276 A were interchanged and afterwards replaced.

The pages are divided into either two or three columns: ff. 1–80 A, two columns; ff. 87 B–318 A (the eight intervening leaves being missing), three columns; ff. 318 B–406 r., two columns; f. 407 r.—end, three columns. The first 317 leaves contain verse only, Items 1–355. The remaining items are prose, except for 357, 374 (*Piers Plowman*), 375, 376, and the lyrics on ff. 407–12.

The first eight leaves (i–viii) of the volume, not included in the foliation referred to above, contain the Index, and also the English version of Ailred's *Informatio ad Sororem Suam* (ed. E. Studien, vii, pp. 304 ff.), both in the same hand. These pages have three columns each. The Index occupies the whole of 1 r., 1 v., 2 r., 2 v., and almost two columns of 3 r. The rest of 3 r. is blank. The *Informatio* begins on f. 3 v.,

headed 'Informacio Alredi abbatis monasterii de Rieualle ad sororem suam inclusa translata de latino in anglicum per Thomam N.' The text ends on f. vi r. As in the rest of the volume there are 80 lines to the page.

The title given in the Index to the whole of the volume is *Salus anime* or *Sowlehele*. In transcribing the Index I have added in square brackets the few titles which the indexer has omitted. It will be observed that a number of the headings given in the Index apply to sections or chapters of a single item, and are not independent pieces. The Roman figures in the Index refer to the folios. The Arabic numerals which I have added indicate the separate items. The lines of the manuscript have been retained. In the notes I have given for each item (i) a reference to the folio on which it begins, (ii) the title by which it is usually known, (iii) in brackets, the title (if any) given in the text (except in the *Northern Homily Cycle*), (iv) the number of lines (I have reckoned the lines of prose as though they were verse), (v) the opening words, (vi) a note on printed editions, where such exist, (vii) any other notes that seemed advisable. In giving editions I have not included modernized versions, Middle English readers, or more or less popular anthologies.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE NOTES

- A.E.L. *Altenglische Legenden*, ed. by C. Horstmann. Paderborn, 1875.
 A.E.L. (2) *Altenglische Legenden*, Neue Folge, ed. by C. Horstmann. Heilbronn, 1881.
 E.E.T.S., 98 *The Minor Poems of the Vernon MS.*, Part I, ed. by C. Horstmann. 1892.
 E.E.T.S., 117 *The Minor Poems of the Vernon MS.*, Part II, ed. by F. J. Furnivall. 1901.
 Patterson *The Middle English Penitential Lyric*, by F. A. Patterson. New York, 1911.
 S.A.E.L. *Sammlung Altenglischer Legenden*, ed. by C. Horstmann. Heilbronn, 1878.
 Yksh.Wr. *Yorkshire Writers*, ed. by C. Horstmann. 2 vols. London, 1895-6.

THE DIALECT OF THE VERNON INDEX

For a fifteenth-century—even early fifteenth-century—document the Vernon Index shows a considerable number of dialectal features, combined in a distinctive manner. The following are the chief phonological characteristics¹: (1) O.E. *æ*: regularly *a*, e.g. *aftur* 1, *-craft* 245, *fader* 4, *gat* 1, *-zat* 128, *zaf* 3, 126, 131, etc., *-zaf* 209, *gladlyche* 324, *had* 303, *hadde* 8, 126, 178, etc., *spak* 134, *pat* (*passim*), *was* (*passim*), *wat* 325, *what* 285, 298, 320, *water* 223. (2) O.E. *ald*: *sold* 2, *tolde* 6. (3) O.E. *an* (not in lengthening group): *an* or *on*, e.g. *candelmasse* 177, *bygan* 129, *man* 18, 125, 126, 131, 169, 183, etc., *mankynde* 298, *mannes* 327, 344, *bynam* 127, *many* 24, *wanhope* 183; *mon*, 213, 252, 285, 288, 301, 326,

¹ The references are to the folio numbers as given in the index.

etc., monnes 284; with secondary stress, womman 124, 195, lemman 298; wommon 127, 130, womon 127, (honge)mon 248. (4) O.E. *and*, *ang*: honde 196, loondes 223; gonge 124, honge(mon) 248, hongede 184, among 176, songes 297; but cf. hange 130. (5) O.E. *ā*: gost 24, 104, 111, etc., holy 27, 30, 111, etc., holi 26, 104, holi(churche) 18, aros 24, soule 283, stones 184. (6) O.E. *æ²*: *a* when shortened: ladde 7, lady 7, 8, 50, etc. (7) O.E. *ear*: armes 132. (8) O.E. *ȝ*: usually *u*; *i* rare, *e* once; *i* before *n*; e.g. burede 24, burpe 2, custe 132, cut 125, cutte 131, 169, 185, dude 126, 176, 298, fuir 345, fuyr 127, hulles 210, luytel 299, put 291, furst(e) 70, 116, 343, sture 323, 324, sturynges 320, vuel 343; (man)kynde 298, styryng 349, knytte 344, synne 346, 349, synnes 228, 238, 242, etc., synful 344; scherte 184. (9) O.E. *æg*: day 8, 59, 104, etc., dayes 130, may 323, mayden, -es, -hod 57, 91, 205, 255, lay 125, 171, 205; seyde 127. (10) O.E. *ēo*: *e*, *eo*, *u*, e.g. herte 240, 324, 344, seuen(e) 46, 134, 196, etc.; heore (pron.) 7, 91, 126, 127, 130, etc.; vr (pron.) 8; these last two forms are probably unstressed. (11) O.E. *ēo*: *e*, *eo*, *u*, *eu*, e.g. deuel 1, 53, 127, etc., frendschype 240, lem(man) 298, nedful 345, prest 125, 130, 197, etc., prestes 196, þefte 244, pre 130, 223, bytwene 5, 53; neoden 320; ful (vb.) 128, 168; freundes 92. (12) O.E. *ēow*: grew 127, kneu 1, knew 299, trewe 92, treupe 24, þrewe 124.

The most important of these points are (3), (8), (10) and (11). The approximate eastern limit of rounded forms for O.E. *ēo* (indicated by the spelling *u*, *eo*, *eu*, *ue*), as I traced it some years ago (see *Rev. English Studies*, III, p. 19), passed from south-east Lancashire through the middle of Derby and Warwick, and east of Oxford towards Reading. The material collected by Professor Moore and his assistants¹ gives a line slightly farther west for part of its course, excluding the whole of Derbyshire; it is true that my evidence for any part of this county in Late M.E. is very slight. M.E.D.C. gives the same eastern boundary (in the Midlands) for *u*, *ui* from O.E. *ȝ* (i.e. including the extreme south of Lancashire, most of Cheshire and Staffordshire, and west Warwickshire). Here again, and this time with more emphasis, I should carry the line far enough east to include west Derbyshire, the place-name evidence for this being good. On the distribution of *on*-forms (point 3) the American map and my results (see R.E.S. III, p. 23) seem to agree, both including south-west Lancashire, Cheshire, west Derbyshire, west Warwickshire, north Gloucestershire, and the area west of these. These three phonological

¹ *Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries: Preliminary Report of an Investigation Based Exclusively on Localized Documents*, by Samuel Moore, Sanford Brown Meech and Harold Whitehall. *Univ. of Michigan Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, vol. XIII, 1935 (abbreviated here as M.E.D.C.).

points then would seem to assign the Vernon Index to an area which includes south Lancashire, perhaps west Derbyshire and west Warwickshire, north Gloucestershire, and certainly Cheshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Worcestershire, Herefordshire. None of the other phonological characteristics shown by the Index argues against this, the *e*-form for O.E. *æ* which is so common in the central west Midlands in Early M.E. having disappeared by the late fourteenth century. There is unfortunately no evidence on the development of O.E. *ēag*, or of the *i*-mutation of O.E. *al* (*el* or *al*) in this text.

Can we determine the area more closely with the help of grammatical features? These follow roughly west-east lines, in distinction to the north-south boundaries of the characteristics just discussed.

The following are the chief points of accident shown by the Vernon Index: (1) Feminine pronoun, nom. *heo* 8, 320, possessive and dat. *heore* 7, 91, 126, 127, 130, etc., once *vr* 8. (2) Plural pronoun, 3rd person, nom. *pey* 186, 257; possessive, *peir* 123, 128, 238; *per* 329; *heore* 346, 350; dat. *hem* 24, 343. (3) Infinitive: *-e*, rarely *-n*: *come* 133, *dyne* 133, *grete* 128, *haue*, 184, *here* 302, *kepe* 8, *knowe* 320, *segge* 126, 133, *schryue* 18, 243, *slepe* 186, etc., etc.; *ben* 350, *demen* 328, *greyppyn* 326. (4) Present participle: *-ynge*: *berynge* 176, *brennynge* 132, *rehersinge* 298, *seggynge* 178, *stondynge* 111. (5) Past participle: prefix *y-* rare; ending of strong past participle usually *-e*; *-en* rare: (weak) *ydrouned* 128, *ymad* 178, *ypeynted* 231; *cald* (title), *offred* 7, 8, *rapt* 5, *wedded* 8, *heled*, 125, *drouned* 126, *rered* 126, *dampned* 127, *saued* 130, *corsed* 176, *closed* 198, *loued* 299, etc., etc.; (strong) *yfounde* 27; *drunke* 130, *founde* 348, *gete* 44, *hange* 130, *knowe* 131, *forsake* 8; *ouercomen* 329, *dronken* 327, *founden* 348, *wryten* 127, 353. (6) 3rd person sing. of pres. indic.: *-eþ*, *-et*; once *-ez*: *beruth* 223, *conteyneþ* 353, *comeþ* 351, *entyseth* 186, *hath* 223, *beginneþ* 344, *t(h)echep* 333, 366, *wyðdrewep* 346; *comet* 351, *lettet* 348, *maket* 223, *ryset* 223, *slepet* 223, *bytoknet* 256; *knytte* 344; *synnez* 351. (7) Plural of pres. indic.: *-en* four times, *-e* once, *-eþ* twice: *bygynnen* (title), *comen* 352, *acusen* 24, *presumen* 329; *haue* 350; *bryngeth* 344, *letteþ* 351. (8) Plural of 'be'; *ben*, *are*.

The present participle gives us no help. The infinitive *-e*, with rare *-en*, suggests, if anything, the central or northern part of the area noted above (see R.E.S. III, pp. 26-7). The past participle prefix still appears in the fifteenth-century writings of Myrc and Audelay, as well as in documents from counties south of Shropshire. Staffordshire, Cheshire, Lancashire and Derbyshire appear to have *-en*, but the first two have *-e* at least occasionally (see R.E.S. III, p. 28). For the third person singular, the single

-es (*-eȝ*) beside the normal *-eþ* (*-et*) tells us that the Vernon Index cannot be placed in the northern part of the north-west Midlands. I have suggested that the southern limit of *-s* forms as a feature of local dialect extends eastward across south Shropshire and north Warwickshire ('from Yarmouth to the source of the Severn', R.E.S. III, p. 29). The line given in M.E.D.C. passes from the Dee to south-east Staffordshire and then eastwards, except for a northerly bend into Nottinghamshire. My line included central and north Shropshire chiefly on the evidence of *-es* forms in Myrc and Audelay, and the American material has at least rare *-es* in Shropshire. The northern limit of *-eth* for plural present includes Worcestershire, Hereford and south-west Shropshire, but excludes practically the whole of Staffordshire (though M.E.D.C. has some slight evidence for *-eth* in South Staffordshire and Warwick. I have noted *-en* forms in fifteenth-century deeds from Lancashire, Cheshire, Derby and Staffordshire (with very rare *-es*). The *-en* forms of the Vernon Index, as well as the use of *ben* and *are* with no *beþ*, point to an area north of Worcestershire, Herefordshire, and Warwickshire. As for the pronouns, the two instances of *heo* and the absence of *scho*, etc., is only slight evidence, but at least does not suggest the most northerly part of the north-west Midlands, while the mixture of Scandinavian and English forms for the plural pronoun, even in the fifteenth century, indicates the more southerly part of the north-west Midlands. Farther north (e.g. Lancashire, see R.E.S. III, p. 32) the *h*-forms are less likely to be found (though M.E.D.C. has some evidence for *hem*); farther south, the *þ*-forms, at least in the possessive, are less likely.

If one takes all these points into consideration, the home of the Vernon Index would seem to fall naturally into the South Shropshire—South Staffordshire area.

There are other interesting linguistic features in the Vernon Index as well as those which are important for the dialect. The most striking is the evidence for the loss of [*χ*] or [*ȝ*] before *t*: *almyty* 300; *boute* 24; *doutour* 127, *downtour* 304; *knyt* 127, 168, 176, 209; *taute* 133 (2). Unstressed syllables with E.M.E. *-e-* (especially *-er*) occasionally have *-u-*: *broþur* 195, 207; *after* 127, 167; *fadur* 111, 114, etc.; *martur* 39; *oþur* 124, 130, etc.; *beruth* 223; *mennus* 344; *troumpus* 195, etc.

A. Column 1.

Here bygynnen þe tytles off þe boók
 þat is cald in latyn tonge Salus
 anime. and in englyhs tonge Sowlehele

1

- (1) De creacione celi & terre & de aliis operibus
 sex dierum
 Qualiter deus posuit adam in paradiso
 & precepit ei ne comederet &c
 Hou þe deuē bygylede Eue Hou adam
 kneu hym self naked aftur is trespas
 Hou god reprouede Adam and Eue ant
 þe deuē
 Hou adam gat caym and abel
 Of noe and of þe flood
 Oof abraham Of ysaac Of iacob.

ij

Hou rebecca sende iacob to laban.
 Hou iacob wrastlede wyt þe angel
 Of iosepes Swyfnēs and he was sold
 Hou þe chylðren of israē wente into Egypte
 Off þe burþe of moyses

iij

How god aperede to moyses in þe busk
 Hou god sende moyses to kyng pharao
 forto delyuere his people
 De plagis egipti
 Hou moyses 3af þe lawe in desert
 Off þe prophecie off balaam
 Of þe dep of moyses

iiij

Off Sampson Of Saul Of David
 Hou absolon pursuwede his fader

v

Hou dauid made sorwe for absolones dep
 Hou dauid noumbrede þe people off israē
 Of þe coronacioun of kyng Salomon [wymmen
 Of þe dom of salomon bytwene tweye comun
 Of salomones ded Of ieroboam
 Of helye And hou he was rat in to þe eyr

vj

Hou heliseus multepliede oyle
 Of daniel Of Abacuc þe profete
 Pat alle þe profetes prophecieden of crist
 Of þe feste of þe conception of vre lady
 Of ioachim and of Anna

vij

Hou þe angel tolde ioachym pat he scholde gete
 vre lady Of ioachimmes offrynge Off
 anna Of þe natiuite off vre lady And
 hou vre lady was offred in to þe temple
 Hou vre lady ladde heore lyf in þe temple

vii

Hou vre lady was wedded to ioseph
 De legacione gabrielis & incarnacone ihesu christi
 Hou ioseph wolde ha forsake vre lady
 Of þe natiuite of vr lord ihesu crist
 Of his circumcicion Hou he was offred
 in þe temple to Symeon Hou he was
 baptised Off þe sorwe þat vre lady
 hadde when heo say vr sone on þe cros
 Hou crist on þe cros bytok hys moder
 to seynt Jon to kepe

- (2) Þat þe martires ben godes knytes
 (3) Of þe nywe 3eres day

ix

- (4) Of þe Epiphanye
 (5) Of seynt hyller þe bisschop
 (6) Of seynt Wolston
 Of seynt Edward þe kyng
 Hou Willyam þe Bastard conquerede
 engelond and slow þe false harald

x

- (7) Of seynt fabyan and Sebastian
 (8) Of seynt Anneys
 (9) Of seynt vincent

xj

- (10) Of seynt Julyan bon hostel (11) Of seynt Blase

xij

- (12) Of seynt Agathe
 (13) Of seynt Scolastica virgine

A. Column 2.

xiiij

- (14) Of seynt valentyn (15) Of seynt Julyan
 (16) Of seynt Mathie þe apostel (17) [Of seynt Gregori]

xiiij

- (18) Off seynt Longine þat openede cristes syde
 (19) Off seynt Edward kyng & martire

xv

- (20) Off seynt Cutberth (21) Of seynt Benet
 (22) Off seynt Julyan (23) Of seynt Brigid virgine

xvj

- (24) Of seynt Oswold (25) Off seynt Ceadde

xviij

- (26) Off seynt Marye Egypcian
 Off seynt Zozyne monk

xviiij

- (27) Off þe feste of þe Anuncioun
 (28) Off þe festes þat ben meoble in holichurche
 (29) Off lente and off fastyng
 Off schryft Ant hou a man schal schryue hym
 (30) Off þe feste of pasche

xix

- (31) Of þe ascensioun (32) Of þe letanie
 Ante sex dies pasche uenit *ihesus* in bethaniam
 Videns *ihesus* ciuitatem fleuit super eam
Cum intrasset *ihesus* *ierosolimam* commota est vniuersa ciuitas
 dicens quis est hic
 Quomodo *ihesus* maledixit ficui & aruit
 De vidua que optulit duo minuta
 Nisi granum frumenti cadens &c
 Nunc iudicium est mundi
 Homo *quidam* erat paterfamilias qui plantauit vinum

xx

Simile est regnum celi sicut regi qui fecit nupcias
 Simile est thesauro abscondito in agro
 Dic nobis quando hec erunt et quod signum aduentur
 Erunt signa in sole & luna
 Videte vigilate & orate nescitis enim *qum* tempora
 Simile est regnum celorum decem virginibus

xxj

Homo *quidam* peregre proficiscens vocauit seruos
 suos & tradidit illis bona sua
Cum venerit filius hominis in maiestate sua
 & omnes angeli eius *cum* eo tunc sedebit
 Sicut quia post biduum pasche fiet
 Ante diem festum pasche sciens *ihesus*

xxij

Non turbetur cor *vestrum* creditis in deum & in me
 Siquis diligit me sermonem meum seruabit
 Egressus est *ihesus* trans torrentem Cedron
 Þe passioun of vre lord iesu crist

xxiiij

Hou ioseph of Aymathie burede crist
 whenne crist aros
 Hou marie magdeleyne boutte vynemens
 for to anvnte *ihesus* crist

ibidem

Maria magd venit mane *cum* adhuc tenebre
 Pat whenne þe disciples wente fro þe
 toumbe wymmen abeden
 Off þe stablenesse and þe treupe of wymmen
 Off hem pat acusen many men for on
 manner defaute

xxv

Duo ex *discipulis* *iesu* ibant in castellum quod erat
 in spacio *stadium* lx
Cum esset sero die illa vna sabbatorum
 Thomas vnus de xij
 Manifestauit se *ihesus* .d.d. ad mare tyberiade
 Dixit *ihesus* petro Petre amas me
 Dixit *ihesus* petro Sequere me

xxvj

Vndecim discipuli abierunt in galileam in
montem vbi constituerat illis ihesus
Recumbentibus xj discipulis apparuit illis ihesus
Of þe descencioun of þe holi gost

(34) Off seynt Alphege

xxvij

(35) Off seynt George

(36) Off seynt Marc þe Euangelist

(37) Off seynt petre off precheres ordre

A. Column 3.

(38) Of seynts phelip & jacobus apostles xxviij

(39) Hou þe holy cros was yfounde

xxix

(40) Off sent Quiriac Yyt off þe cros

xxx

Miracles off þe holy cros

(41) Off seynt Donston

(42) Off seynt Aldelm

xxxj

(43) Off seynt Austyn (44) Of seynt purnele

(45) Off seynt Barnabe þe apostel

(46) Of seynt Edburgh

xxxij

(47) Off seynt Albon (48) Of seynt aelbrith kyng

(49) Of seynt Etheldrede virgine

xxxij

(50) Off seynt Botulf (51) Of seynt Patryke

Off seynt patrikes purgatorie

xxxv

(52) Of seynt Ihon þe baptiste

(53) Of seynt Petre þe apostel

xxxvj

Of cornelie þat petre conuertede

Of Symon magus

xxxvij

De passioun of petre and poul

(54) Of seynt Frontoun

(55) Of seynt Poul þe apostel

xxxviii

(56) Of seynt Athelwold

(57) Of seynt Osewold kyng and martir

xxxix

(58) Off seynt kenelm kyng and martir

(59) Off seynt Margarete

xl

(60) Off seynt Marie Magdeleyn

- xlj
- (61) Of seynt Mildrede
(62) Of seynt Cristyne
- xliij
- (63) Of seynt Jame þe apostel
(64) Of seynt Alex
- xliiij
- (65) Off þe Wadur and þe modur off seynt
Gregory and hou he was gete
- xlvj
- (66) Of þe Seuen sleperes
- xlviij
- (67) Off seynt Dominik
- xlviij
- (68) Off sent Oswald
(69) Of seynt Cristofore
- xlix
- (70) De sancto Laurencio
(71) De sancto ypolito *martyre*
- .l.
- (72) Of þe Assumpcioun of vre lady
- lj
- (73) Of seynt bartholomeu þe apostel
(74) Of seynt Gyle
- liij
- (75) Off seynt Egwyn
(76) Of seynt Matheu apostel & euangelist
- liiij
- (77) Of seynt Michel archangel [þe deuel
Of þe batayle bytwene seynt michel and
- liiiij
- (78) Of seynt jerom (79) Of seynt justyne
Of seynt Ciprian
- lv
- (80) Of seynt leger (81) Of seynt Fraunceys
- lvj
- (82) Of seynt denys
- lvij
- (83) Off seynt luc þe euangelist
(84) Of enleuene þousand maydenes
- lviiij
- (85) Off seyntus Symound and jude
(86) Of alle halewen

B. Column 1.

- lix
- (87) Of alle soulen day
- lx
- (88) Of seynt Martin þe bysschop

- lxj
- (89) Of seynt Brys (90) Off seynt Edmund
- lxij
- (91) Of seynt Edmund þe kyng
(92) Of seynt cecile virgyne
- lxijj
- (93) Of seynt Clement þe pope & martyr
- lxv
- (94) Of seynt Kateryne
- lxvj
- (95) Of seynt Andrewe þe apostel
(96) Of seynt Nicholas
- lxvijj
- (97) Of seynt Lucye (98) Of seynt Marthe
- lxix
- Of seynt frontoun (99) Of seynt Thomas apostoli
- lxx
- (100) Off seynt steuene furste martyr
- lxxj
- (101) Of seynt Ihon þe euangeliste
- lxxij
- (102) Of seynt Thomas erchebhisshop of *canterbury*
- lxxx
- (103) Of seynt Siluestre pape
- lxxxj
- (104) Of seynt Brendan
- lxxxijj
- (105) Of seynt Leger (106) Of seynt Fey
(107) Of seynt Quintyn
- lxxxiiij
- (108) Of seynt Freþewyde virgyne
(109) Off seynt Leonard abbot
(110) De iacobo interciso
- lxxxv
- (111) Of kyng Offe
Of seynt Fremund kyng
- lxxxviij
- (112) Of kyng Ethelbryth (113) Of seynt Anastase
(114) De sancta paula
- lxxxix
- (115) Of seynt Ambrose Bhysschope
- xc [Emperour
Hou ambrose reprouede Theodosie þe
- xcj
- (116) Of a mayden off antioche
Hou a mayden was in an hous of bordel
and sauede heore maydenhod

- xcij
- (117) Of tweye trewe freundes
De sancta Theodora virgyne
- xcij
- (118) Of seynt Bernard.
- xcv
- (119) Of seynt Austyn þe doctour
- xcix
- (120) Of seyntz sauine
- .C.
- (121) Of Barlaam & Iosaphat
- .C.ij
- (122) De sancta sauina que & Smaragdus
- .C.iiij
- (123) Of þe Anunciacioun ihesu crist
Of his Natiuite Of his circumcisioun
Hou he offred to Symeon Of þe passioun
Of þe resurrexioun Of þe asscensioun
Of þe sendyng of þe holi gost
Of þe comyngge to þe day of dom
And opere diuerse Stories of ihesu
crist and of his modur þe whyche
in diuerse paneles in peyntur and
euery panel had his scripture acordaunt
þer to þe whiche peynture his table
suffisaunt
- Cxi
- Pe pyte of crist stondyng in þe sepulcre
Pe scheld off þe fey Pe scheld of þe
[passioun]

B. Column 2.

- (124) Diuerse orisones to þe fadur and to þe sone
and to þe holy gost whit peyntures
- .C.xij
- Salutaciones to vre lady wyt peynture annex
- .C.xiiij
- 3yt salutaciouns to vre lady
- (125) Miserere mei deus secundum magnam misericordiam
tuam in englis and in latin
- (126) An orisoun to þe Trynite in english
- .C.xiiij
- (127) A confessioun to god
- (128) An orisoun to vre lady
- (129) Sixe salutacions to þe trinite in tyme
of þe eleuacioun of godes body
- (130) And orysoun to godes body at þe leuacioun
- (131) Fyue ioyes of vre lady
- (132) An orysoun to god þe fadur
- (133) An orysoun to god þe sone

.C.xv

- (134) An orysoun to vre lady
 (135) An orysoun to godes soone
 (136) An confessioun of wyschyp in orysoun
 (137) [A prayer to our Lady]
 (138) [A prayer for the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost]
 (139) A confessioun for negligence of þe dedes of mercy
 (140) An orysoun for sauynge of þe fyue wyttes
 (141) An orisoun for negligence of þe .x. commande
 (142) Patris sapiencia [mens]

.C.xvj

- (143) Veni creator spiritus
 (144) [The sweetness of Jesus]
 (145) [A prayer to Jesus] [vers]
 (146) Of euery psalme of þe sauter þe furste

.C.xxj

- Cantemus domino gloriose
 (147) A salutacioun to vre lady

.C.xxij

- (148) An orisoun to þe fyue woundes of ihesus christus
 (149) An orisoun to þe fyue ioyes of vre lady
 (150) A salutacioun to vre lady
 (151) Fyfty salutaciouns to vre lady by þis
 word .Aue. heyl be þu &c
 Miracles of vre lady

.C.xxiiij

- (152) Hou þe cite of croteye was delyuered
 of þeir enemys by vre lady coote

.C.xxiiij

- (153) Hou þe Iewes in despit of vre lady þrewe
 a chyld in a gonge
 (154) Hou an holy hermyt prayde a synful
 womman pray god for hym
 (155) Hou a Iew putte his sone in a brennyngge
 ouene for he was communed wit opur
 cristene children on þe pask day

.C.xxv

- (156) Hou a man for ache cut of his foot and
 was heled azeyn by vre lady

ibidem

- (157) Hou a iew lente a cristenemon moneye
 and took vre lady to borow
 (158) Of a prest þat lay by a nonne

.C.xxvj

- (159) Hou vre lady zaf mylk off heore pappes
 to a man þat hadde þe squynacye

.C.xxvj

- (160) Of an incontinent monk þat was drouned
 and rered azeyn by vre lady to lyfe
 (161) Of a clerk þat wolde euery day segge þe
 fyue ioyes of vre lady
 (162) Hou vre lady dude þe offys of a sextresse
 fyftene zeer for a nonne

.C.xxvii

- (163) Hou a god wyf bynam fro an ymage of
vre lady þe ymage of heore child
(164) Of a deuout knyht off kyrkeby
(165) Hou a womon slow heore doutour hose-
bonde and was dampned to þe fuyr
and delyuered by vre lady
(166) Hou þe deucl took lyknesse of a wommon
and seyde he was godes modur
(167) Hou out of a monkes mouth aftur his
deeth grew a lilie and in euery leef
was wryten wyt large lettres of
gold. Aue maria.

B. Column 3.

C.xxviii

- (168) Hou a nonne furgat to grete vre lad[y]
and ful in apostasye
(169) Hou seynt Bernard say twey children
ydrowned for þeir inobedience
(170) Of þys antynene Salue regina

C.xxix

- (171) Hou vre lady sauter bygan
(172) Hou vre lady was a medewyf in þe
churche of seynt michel in monte tumba
(173) Hou þe feste of þe natiuite of vre lad[y]
bygan (174) Of a deuout clerk þat died
in drenkelenscipe & was wyrned
sepulture

C.xxx.

- (175) Of a þef þat was þre dayes hange
and saued by vre lady
(176) Of a prest þat coude non opur masse
but Salue *sancta* parens
(177) Hou þe deucl in liknesse of a bole and of
opur bestes encumbrede a monke for
he was ones drunke
(178) Of a wommon off Rome þat conceyuede
bi heore owne sone & slou heore child

.C.xxxi

- (179) Off a child þat weddede an ymage of
vre lady
(180) Hou at þe cite of Tholuse þe priuetes
were knowe of Iewes
(181) Hou vre lady 3af to seynt Bonyce þe
bisschoph holy vestemens
(182) Hou þe deucl in fals liknesse of seynt
Iame made a man cutte of his priue
[menbres]

C.xxxij

- (183) Of a monk of Cisteus þat vre lady
took in heore armes and custe hym
(184) Hou Constantyn þe Emperour ordeynede
for eueremor in seynt petre churche
at Rome in wyschipe of seynt petre
a lampe wyt Baume perpetuelly bren
nyngge

- (185) Of seynt fulbert þe bisschop þat made þe
Storye and þe legende and opur tretys
off þe natiuite of vre lady
- (186) Of a mayden þat was cald Musa
- .C.xxxiiij
- (187) Of a malicious priour of seynt sauours
of þe cite of papye
- (188) Of seynt Ierom bisschoph of papye
- (189) Of a whyth corporaus was intynt
wit red wyn in seynt Micheles
churche þat his cald cluse
- (190) Hou vre lady taute a clerk hou he
schulde segge heore complyn
- (191) Of þe schrewednesse of Iustynyan
þe emperour (192) And why þe feste of
þe purificacioun was ordeyned
- (193) Hou an ymage of þe child off vre lady
taute anopur child and preyde
hym to come dyne wyt hym

.C.xxxiiij

- (194) Þe seuene psalmes
- (195) To euery apostel on orysoun
- (196) An orisoun to alle þe apostles
- (197) An orison to seynt Michel
- (198) An orysoun to seynt Ion þe baptist
- (199) Salutacions to ihesu crist
- (200) An orysoun to þe Trynite
- (201) Salutacions to vre lady
- (202) O vere beata & intemerata
- (203) An orysoun of bede off þe
seuene wordes þat crist spak last in
þe cros
- (204) Letanie off vre lady þat seynt bernard
made
- (205) Opur orisones to vre lady
- (206) Matyns of þe passioun
- (207) Orisons off seynt anselmes meditaciouns

Þe gospeles

C. Column 1.

.C.lxvj

- (208) *Ecce ego mittam angelum meum ante faciem
tuam qui preparabit viam tuam ante te*
Þe conuersion of Marie Magdeleyne

.C.l.xvij

- (209) *Erunt signa in sole & luna*
Hou a monk aftur his deth scheuede to
his felawe hys stat
- (210) *Cum audisset iohannes in vinculis opera christi*

.C.lxviii

- Arguebat iohannes herodem*
- (211) *Missus est angelus Gabriel*
Of a deuout knyght þat ful in to pouerte

C.lxi

- (212) Exurgens maria abijt in montana
 (213) Miserunt iudei ab ierosolomis sacerdotes &c
 Hou a man *pat* wente toward seynt Iame
 cutte of his neþur herneys

.C.lxx

- (214) Cum esset desponsata mater ihesu maria
 (215) Exijt edictum a cesare augusto
 Hou þe deuel apperede to seynt martyn

.C.lxxj

- (216) In principio erat verbum
 (217) Erant ioseph & maria mater ihesu mirantes
 Hou a bisschop lay by a nonne

C.lxxij

- (218) Postquam completi sunt dies octo
 (219) Defuncto herode

C.lxxiij

- (220) Cum natus esset ihesus in bethleem iude

.C.lxxiiij

- (221) Vidit iohannes ihesum venientem
 (222) Venit ihesus a galilea in iordanem
 (223) Cum factus esset ihesus annorum duodecim

C.lxxv

- Hou a bisschoph myskeppe a child *pat* seynt
 ion þe euangelist bytook hym
 (224) Nupcie facte sunt in chana galilee
 (225) Cum descendisset ihesus de monte secute sunt eum turbe

C.lxxvj

- Pat spiritualite scholde not be sold
 (226) [Ascendente ihesu in nauculam secuti sunt.]
 Hou a knyht dude his penaunce among
 wormes in a whycche
 (227) [Simile est regnum celorum homini qui seminavit]
 Hou macarie say þe deuel berynge his
 boystes wit his corsed drenches

C.lxxvij

- (228) Postquam inpleti sunt dies purgaciones
 Hou vre lady 3af a godwyf a Sherge on
 þe candelmasse day
 Hou an abbess wyt childe was delyuered
 bi help of vre lady

C.lxxviiij

- (229) Simile est regnum celorum homini patrifamilias
 qui exijt primo mane conducere operarios
 Hou þe deuel bygylede a monk seggyng
 þat his fadur deed & hadde ymad hym
 his executour

C.lxxix

- (230) *Cum turba plurima conuenirent & de civitatibus properarent*

- (231) *Assumpsit ihesus xij discipulos suos & ait illis*
Hou seynt Marine was diffamed

C.lxxx

- (232) *Pater noster for seynt bernardes palfray*
Ductus est ihesus in desertum a spiritu
Pe storye of placidas

C.lxxxiiij

- (233) *Egressus ihesus secessit in partes tyri & sidonis*
Hou on hermyt put a 3ong man in
wanhope

C.lxxxiiiij

- (234) [*Erat Ihesus eiciens demonium*]
Hou stones answered seynt Bede
- (235) [*Dixit Ihesus turbis Iudeorum*]
Hou a wyf hongede heore husbondes
Scherte bifore heore for to haue moynde
off hym

C.lxxxv

- (236) *Maria magdalene & maria iacobi & salome*
Hou seynt martyn cutte his mantel
and 3af hyt a poore man

C. Column 2.

- (237) *Duo ex discipulis ihesu ibant &c*

C.lxxxvj

- (238) *Stetit ihesus in medio discipulorum*
Hou pe deucl entyseth men to slepe
when þey scholde here godes wordes
- (239) *Manifestauit se iterum ihesus ad mare tiberiadis*

C.lxxxviij

- (240) *Maria stabat ad monumentum*
- (241) *Vndecim discipuli abierunt in galileam*

C.lxxxviiij

- (242) *Vna sabbati maria magdalene*
- (243) *Cum sero esset die illo & fores essent clause*

C.lxxxix

- Hou pe deucl wolde haue encombred seynt
Edmund
- (244) [*Dixit Ihesus discipulis suis Ego sum pastor*]
Hou pe Fundour of Clereuaus was saued
by a mesel
- (245) *Modicum & non videbitis me* [paradys
Of a monk desired to see þe leste blisse of

.C.xc

- (246) *Vado ad eum qui me misit*
- (247) *Amen amen dico vobis siquid pecieritis*
- (248) *Quis vestrum habebit amicum*
- (249) *Subleuatis oculis ihesus in celum*

.C.xcj

- (250) Recumbentibus vndecim discipulis
Of seynt Carp
(251) Si diligatis me mandata mea seruare
(252) Si quis diligat me sermonem meum seruabit

.C.xcuj

- Off þe fruyt of obedience
(253) Amen amen dico vobis *qui non intrat per ostium*
(254) Nemo potest venire ad me nisi

.C.xcuij

- (255) Conuocatis *ihesus xij apostolis*
(256) Factum est in vna dierum

.C.xcuiij

- (257) Surgens *ihesus* de synagoga
(258) Erat homo ex phariseis *nichodemus nomine*
(259) Sic deus dilexit mundum

.C.xcv [womman]

- Þe conuersion of thaysis þat was a commun
(260) *Cum venerit paraclitus*
Hou a kyng aferde his broþur wit troum-
pus and wit clariones
(261) *De festo corporis christi*
Quare in altari videmus corpus *christi* in
forma panis & non forma carnis

.C.xcvj

- Þat þe hoste þat godes body schal be
made off schal be of clene whete
Hou a prestes hond was persed wit an host
Hou þe offys of þe masse was ordeyned
by diuerse popes
(262) Seuene Miracles þat bitydde by godes body

.C.xcvij

- A fructuous tale of a religious man
A tale of a parissh prest
A tale of felix presbiter
Hou a man þat was deed ant in penaunce
was delyuered by a masse

.C.xcviii

- [Narracio bede]
Of a man þat was closed in a myne
(263) *Homo quidam erat diues qui induebatur*

.C.xcix

- (264) *Homo quidam fecit cenam magnam*
Of an angel and an heremyt þat
smelleden in contrarie
(265) *Accesserunt ad ihesum publicani & peccatores*
(266) *Estote misericordes*
Hou on demed anoþur for brekyng
of his fast

CC

- (267) Cum turbe multe venirent ad *ihesum*
 (268) Amen amen dico uobis nisi habundauerit
 (269) Cum turba multa esset cum *ihesu*
 (270) Attendite a falsis prophetis
 (271) Homo quidam est diues qui habebat villicum

CC.j

- (272) Cum appropinquasset *ihesus ierusalem* videns civitatem

C. Column 3.

- (273) Dixit *ihesus* ad quosdam qui in se confidebant
 Of seynt Oseweld þe kyng

CC.ij

- (274) Exiens *ihesus* de finibus tiri
 (275) Beati oculi qui vident qui vident que

CC.ijj

Pe storne off Theofle

CC.ijnj

- (276) Dum iret *ihesus* in *ierusalem* transibat per mediam

CC.v

- Hou a prest bylay a mayden
 (277) Nemo potest duobus dominis seruire

CC.vj

[money

- Hou a man wytdrow his almesse forto gadere
 (278) Ibat *ihesus* in ciuitatem que vocatur Naym

CC.vij

- Of an holy monk *pat* hadde a wycked broþur
 (279) Cum intrasset *ihesus* in domum cuiusdam principis

CC.viiij

Pe conuersioun off Pelagie peccatriciis

CC.ix

- (280) Conuenerunt pharisei in vnum
 Pou a knyht forȝaf anopur knyht his
 fadur deth on þe gode freday

CC.x

- (281) Ascendens *ihesus* in nauculam transfretaunt
 Hou seynt Gregori prayde for a dampned man
 Hou kyng Alisaundre enclosede certeyn
 Iewes wytynne certeyn hulles
 (282) Simile est regnum celorum homini regi qui fecit nupcias

CC.xj

- Of Gregories fadur dustren
 (283) Erat quidam regulus cuius filius

CC.xij

- Of a nonne *pat* feynede heore self a foul
 (284) Simile est regnum celorum homini regi qui voluit
 racionem ponere cum seruis suis

CC. xij

- Of a monk *pat* was a bakbytere
 (285) Abeuntes pharisei consilium inierunt vt
 caperent *ihesum* in sermone
 Of a mon and of Mardocheus
 (286) Cum subleuasset oculos *ihesus* & vidisset quia
 multitudo maxima

CC. xiiij

Off pierys tollere *pe* ryche

CC. xv

- (287) Nisi granum frumenti cadens &c
 (288) Stabat *iohannes* & ex discipulis eius duo

CC. xvj

- (289) Ambulans *ihesus* iuxta mare galilee
 (290) Liber generaonis *ihesu christi*
 (291) Thomas vnus de duodecim

CC. xvij

- (292) Ecce ego mitto ad vos prophetas & sapientes

CC. xviiij

- (293) Dixit *ihesus* petro Sequere me
 (294) Angelus domini apparuit *ioseph*

CC. xix

- (295) Nisi granum frumenti cadens in terram
 (296) Ecce nos reliquimus omnia
 (297) [Postquam impleti sunt]
 (298) Venit *ihesus* in partes cesarie philippi

CC. xx

- (299) Confiteor tibi pater celi & terre
 (300) [Missus est ang. Gabriel]
 (301) Non turbetur cor vestrum neque formidet
 (302) Erat homo ex phariseis *nichodemus* nomine
 (303) [Dixit *Ihesus* Petro sequere me]

CC. xxj

- (304) Hoc est preceptum meum ut diligatis
 (305) [Venit *Iesus* in partes Cesaree Phil.]
 (306) Iussit *ihesus* discipulos suos ascendere in nauiclam

CC. xxij

- (307) Simile est regnum celorum thesauro abscond
 (308) Negabat *ihesum* quidam phariseus ut manducaret

CC. xxiiij

Of a best *pat* is like a man in visage
Pat *pe* mirre tre beruth *pre* maner gumes
Pat a bryd when he ryset maket a croys
 wit his whynges
Pat a man hath two maner loondes
 to ferme
 Of a Fysch *pat* euere slepet in *pe* water

D. Column 1.

- An ensample by a bryd in a cage
 (309) Accessit ad *ihesum* mater *filiorum* *zebedei*
 (310) [Nisi granum frum.]
 (311) Intrauit *ihesus* in quoddam castellum
 (312) Facta est contencio inter discipulos

CC.xxiii

- (313) [Liber generationis *Ihesu christi*]
 (314) Nunc iudicium est mundi
 (315) Vidit *ihesus* hominem sedentem

CC.xxv

- (316) Quis putas est maior in regno celorum
 (317) Designauit dominus & alios lxxij discipulos
 (318) Hec mando vobis ut diligatis inuicem

CC.xxvj

- (319) Videns *ihesus* turbas ascendit in montem
 (320) Vos estis sal terre

CC.xxvii

- (321) Egressus *ihesus* perambulabat iherico
 (322) Hou a man schal lyue parfytly
 Videte vocacionem vestram

CC.xxviii

Of þe seuen dedly synnes
 Seuene blessynges of god
 Seuene medicines for þe seuen dedly synnes

CC.xxix

- Þe ten comaundemens of god
 Seuene vertues of god
 Twelue articles of þe fey
 Þe seuen sacromens of holy church
 [Þe seuen principal vertues]
 Seuene werkes of god
 (323) Þe visiones of seynt Poul whan he was
 rauysed in to paradys

CC.xxx

- (324) Þe pope Trental
 CC.xxxj
 (325) Pater noster in a table ypeynted
 (326) Pater noster exponed by þe vij petitiones

CC.xxxij

Pater noster exponed by euery word

CC.xxxiij

Þe ten comaundemens

CC.xxxiii

Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem
 Eft sones pater noster exponed by euery word

CC.xxxvii

Of þe seuen dedly synnes and of þeir braunches

CC.xxxix

Of meknesse and of heore braunches

CC.xl

Of enuye Of presumpcioun of herte

Of frendschype of charite

Of rythwysnesse Of parfyt charite

CC.xlj

Of Euenhede Of strengþe Of ydelnesse

CC.xliij

Of prowessse

Remedie aȝeyn dedly synnes

A tretys off schryfte

CC.xliij

Hou a man schal schryue hym

CC.xliiij

Of þe ȝyft of counseyl

Pat þer ben fyfe maner of þefte

CC.xlv

Of commoun robbours Of false executours

Of false dettours Of false prelates

Of false officials Of false somnours

Of false pledours Of false whithes

Of false aduoketes Of false notaries

Of false sysours Of sacrilegie

Of chaniours off benefices

Of false freres Of whichecraft

CC.xlvj

Of fals wryþynge Of false marchans wit

false mesures Of commoun wymmen

Of lacchedrawerres Of heroudes of armes

Of dys playeres Of þe hongemon

Of Mercy and of heore braunches

CC.xlix

Of Almusdede and his branches

CC.l

Of lecherie and of hys braunches

D. Column 2.

CC.lj

Of chastite and of heore braunches

CC.liij

Of þe principal festes of þe ȝer pat ben meoble

What a mon scholde do at churchre

CC.liiij

Yyt of þe branches of chastite

CClv

[ilic

Pat maydenhod and chastite ben likned to a

CC.lvj

What bytoknet þe greynes in a lihe
 Of þe staat off clerkes
 What bytoknet þe aube and opur vestimens
 of holy churche

CC.lviij

Of Men of religioun hou þey scholde lyue

CC.lviiij

Of glotonye and of his braunches

CC.lix

Of Idelnesse Of auautyngge

CC.lxj

Of þe 3yftes of wysdom

CC.lxij

Of sobernesse and of his degres

CC.lxiiiij

- (327) Þe pricke of conscience. þat is departed
 in seuen bokes

CC.lxxxiiij

- (328) Þe pricke of Loue Of meditacioun of þy
 self Meditacioun of þe soule
 Of contemplacioun in creature

CC.lxxxiiijj

Contemplacioun in þe holy gost
 Of þe seuen 3yftes of þe holy gost
 Of þe seuen vertues
 Of þe ten comaundemens
 Of þe twolue articles of vre fey
 Of þe seuene sacramens
 Of þe seuen dedes of mercy
 Of þe seuen drueries of monnes body

CC.lxxxv

- Hou and what a mon scholde þenke euery
 houre of þe day
 (329) A disputisoun bytwene þe bodi and þe soule

CC.lxxxvj

- (330) Þe Lamentacioun þat was bytwene vre
 lady and seynt bernard

CC.lxxxviiij

- (331) A disputison bytwene a good mon and þe deuel
 and he wente Froward church

CC.xc

- (332) Wher þe put of helle is Of þe planetes
 Of þe elemens

CC.xc

- (333) Þe castel þat Robert Grosteat made

CC.xcvj

- (334) Ypotys þat noble tretys

CC.xcvj

- (335) Of þre messagers of deeth

- (336) An orisoun to crist (337) Songes to vre lady

CC.xcviij

- (338) Orisones to vre lady rehersinge of crist what
-
- he dude and suffrede for mankynde

- (339) Þat crist is called lemman to a clene soule

CC.xcix

- (340) Þat god is ouer alle þyng to be loued

- (341) A huytul sermoun of good edificacioun

- (342) Of Robard kyng of cisile hou he was
-
- meked til he knew god

CCC

- (343) Of þe childhede of god almyty

CCC.i

- (344) A disputison bytwene a cristene mon and a Iew

CCC.ij

- (345) Hou a man scholde here his masse

CCC.iiij

- (346) Þe goldene trental (347) Þat a man had þre ene-
- ^[mys]

CCC.iiiij

- (348) Hou þe soudan of Damas was cristned þorow
-
- weddyng of þe kynges dowlour of Taars

D. Column 3.

CCC.vj

- (349) Prouerbes of diuerse profetes and of poetes
-
- and of opur seyntes

CCC.ix

- (350) CAton petyt caton and graunt catoun

[CCC.xiv]

- (351) [Stations of Rome]

[CCC.xv]

- (352) [Dispute between Mary and the Cross]

[CCC.xvij]

- (353) [Susannah]

[CCC.xviiij]

- (354) [Testamentum Christi]

- (355) [Incipit tractatus cuius titulus dicitur stimulus amoris]

CCC.xix

An orison to god hou we schulle dispose vs
for to haue contemplacioun of cristes passioun
An orison to ihesu crist

CCC.xx

A meditacioun of vre lady hou heo hadde heore
 on þe gode freday
 Þat þer neoden six zynge forto knowe
 what crist þolede
 Hou cristes passioun may be likned to foure
 sturyngges of þe soule

CCC.xxj

Of seuenfold rysyng in to contemplacioun þorou
 cristes passioun aftur þe seuenfold *grace* of holigost

CCC.xxij

Hou crist in his passioun hadde seuen blessinges

CCC.xxijj

A preyere to vr lord aboute hys passioun
 Hou a man may most plesse god
 Hou a man schal sture hym self to loue god

CCC.xxiiij

Hou a man schal gladlyche zyue his herte to god
 Hou a man schal ordeyne his zouhtes
 Hou a man schal sture hym self to serue god
 Hou a man schal parfytly loue god

CCC.xxv

Hou a man in his doynge may be contemplatyf
 Of loue and of wat myzt loue is
 Hou a man may be wel ordeyned in þouth
 and word and wer

CCC.xxvj

Hou a man may ordeyned anente his euen *cristen*
 Hou þe louere of soules schal ordeyne hym
 Þat a mon schal for loue of *crist* dispysse þe wordle
 Hou a man schal greypyn hym bifore þe
 recyuyng of þe sacrament
 Whuche þynges wol brynge a mon to *contemplacion*

CCC.xxvij

Hou ioyeful hit is to a mon and in what manere
 he may plesse god
 Hou a mon in schort tyme may be parfyt
 Hou a mannes soule byfore rauisschyng may
 be maad dronken

CCC.xxxviii

Þat a *contemplatif* mon schal not demen oþer men
 Þat a *contemplatif* mon holde hym self non beter
 þen an oþer

CCC.xxix

Azeyn proude men þat presumen of hem self
 Þat þer are fewe wel abeysaunt to þer souereyns
 Þat temptaciouns are nedful and profitable
 Hou *temptacioun* of *predestinacioun* or of desper
 may be ouercomen

CCC. xxx

A complaynyng of þe flesch to þe fadur of crist
and of his soule
A deuout exposicion of þe Pater noster

CCC. xxxj

A deuout meditacioun of þe gretynge of vre lady

CCC. xxxij

A deuout meditacioun vpon þe Antem
Salve regina misericorde

CCC. xxxiij

Of þe stat of blessed soules
(356) A tretys hou god apperede to an holy man
(357) [Vnkuinde mon]
(358) A tretys þat techep to loue god

CCC. xxxiiij

(359) Þe forme of parfyt lyuyng þat Richar
hermyt of hampulle made

CCC. lxiix

Of actyf lyf and of contemplatyf lyf
(360) [Ego dormio]

CCC. lxx

(361) Þe psalme *Qui habitat expounded*

CCC. lxxij

(362) [Þe psalme *Bonum est confiteri expounded*]

CCC. xliij

(363) Þat þe Inner hauyng of man be lyk to þe
vttur hauyng

E. Column 1.

CCC. xliij

Of actyf lyf and þe werkes þer of
Of contemplacioun and þe werkes þer of
Of þe furst partye of contemplacioun
Of þe lowere degre of contemplacioun
Hou þu schalt knowe whon þe schewynges
to þe bodyli wyttes and þe felynges of
hem are god or vnel

CCC. xliiij

What knytte ihesu to mannes soule
Hou and in which þynges a contemplatyf
mon schulde be occupied
Hou in resun and in wille vertu bygynnep
Of þe menes þat bryngeth to contemplacioun
Who schul blame mennus defautes
Why meke men schulde worschip opur
Hou men schulde do þat ben not meke
Þat ypocrites and heretyks ben proude in herte

CCC.xlv

What þynges men ouȝte to trowe sikerly
 Hou stable entent and discrecion ben
 nedful to plesse wit god
 Of þe fur of Loue

CCC.xlvj

Hou men schul do þat are traauayled wyþ veyn
 þouthes in heore preyerres
 Of meditacion of synful men
 Pat meditacioun of crist and of his passioun
 his a ȝyft of þe holy goste
 Pat þe meditacioun of cristes passion
 wyþdraweþ a mon fro synne
 Remedies aȝeyn temptacioun of þe deuel

CCC.xlvij

Pat a mon schulde not ȝyue hym to idelnesse
 Pat a man schulde knowe mesure of his ȝift
 Hou a man schal knowe þe worþynes of
 his soule
 Hou vche man may be saued bi þe passion
 of ihesu crist
 Pat a mon schulde be bysi to rekeuere
 aȝeyn his worþinesse

CCC.xlvij

Hou ihesu schal be souȝt desired & founden
 What profit hit is to haue þe desir of ihesu
 Wer ihesu schal souȝt and founde
 What lettet a man heere and see ihesu
 wit ynne hym self

CCC.xlix

What pryde is and what synne is
 Hou pride in heretiks and in ypocrites
 is dedly synne
 Hou diuerse states in holichurche schul
 haue diuerse medes in heuene
 A schort styryng to meknesse and to charite
 Hou a man schal knowe hou muche pruy
 de is in hym

CCC.l

Of envye and ire and of heore braunches
 Pat hit is muche maystrie to loue men
 in charite and hate wysly heore synnes
 Pat for þe same dedes men schul haue
 diuerse medes
 Pat al mennes dedes scholde ben approued
 pat liknesse haue of gode saue þe open
 heretik & þe open cursed man
 Pat no god dede may make men siker
 wyþoute charite
 Hou a man schal wyte hou muche Ire &
 envye is in his herte
 Be what toknes þu schalt knowe ȝif þu
 loue þyn enemys
 Hou a man schal knowe hou muche coue-
 tise is in hym

CCC.lj

Hou a man schal knowe whenne he synnez
 dedly & whenne venially
 Hou lecherie schulde be destroyed
 Pat a man schulde be besy forto wyþdrawe
 hymself fro synne
 Pat hungur and oþur pynes of þe body

E. Column 2.

letteþ muche gostly worchyng
 What remedie a man schal vse aȝeyn lust
 in etyng and drynkyng
 What comeþ of meknesse of þe ymage of
 synne and what comet in be þe wyn-
 dowes þer of

CCC.lij

Hou an ancre schal haue hir to hem þat
 comen to hyre

CCC.liij

- (364) A boc þat was wryten to a wordly lord
 to teche hym hou he schulde haue hym
 in his stat in ordeynd loue to god and
 to his euenecristene. And þe boc
 conteyneþ xxviij chapitres þe whuche
 chapitres ben marked at þe bygynnyng
 of þe boc

CCC.lv

- (365) Þe mirour of seynt Edmund In quo conti-
 nentur xxj capitula & uocantur in principio

CCC.lix

- (366) Þe abbeye of þe holygost

CCC.lx

- (367) Þe chartre of þe abbeye of þe holygost

CCC.lxiij

- (368) A tretys de spiritu Gwydonis

CCC.lxvj

- (369) A confessioun þat thecheþ a man hou he
 schal schryue hym self

CCC.lxvij

- (370) A talkyng of þe loue of god

CCC.xxvix

- (371) *Þe roule of reclous. Recti diligunt te*

CCC.lxxij

Þe fyue gretynge of vre lady

CCC.lxxiij

An oryson to vre lady in latin O sancta
 virgo virginum que genuisti filium &c
 Omnis custodia serua cor tuum

CCC.lxxiiij

Mors & vita in manibus lingue

CCC.lxxx

Ʒat þe lyon is likned to pruyde
 þe Neddre to envye þe Vniconr to
 wrappe þe Beore to Slouþe
 þe Vox to couetyse þe Souwe to
 Glotonye þe Scorpion to lecherie

CCC.lxxxv

Ʒe fyfþe boc off Scryft

CCC.lxxxviij

Ʒe sixte bok off Scryft

CCC.lxxxix

Ʒe boc of cler loue of herte Si linguis hominis

CCC.xci

- (372) Nichil absconditum quod non reuelatur neque
 occultum quod non sciatur

CCC.xcij

Ite maledicta in ignem eternum
 Ignis sulphur & spiritus procellarum
 Hapud aspidum suggest
 Legatus manibus & pedibus proicite &c
 Misericordias domini in eternum cantabo
 Beati pauperes spiritu
 Vos estis qui permansistis mecum
 Facite vobis amicos de mammona iniquitatis

CCC.xc[i]ij

- (373) Ʒe lyff of adam and of Eue

CCC.xciiiij

- (374) Petrus plowmon

CCCC.iiij

- (375) [Joseph of Arimathea]

CCCC.iiiij

- (376) [Judas and Pilate]

CCCC.vij

- (377) [Lyrics]

NOTES

(1)-(112) Southern Legend Collection. Only Items 64 and 65 have been printed.
 For list of items see E.E.T.S., 87 (edition of MS. Laud 108).

(1) Old Testament Story and Life of Christ. The top inner corner of the first page (i.e. the recto of f. 1 A) is torn away, but little more than a large initial is missing.
 2706 ll. Inc.:...hit comeþ in my þouht. Ʒe muchele sor and sunne.

(2) Prologue. f. 8 B. 10 ll. Inc.: Men wilneþ muchel to here tell of Bataile of kynges.

(3) New Year's Day. f. 8 B. 28 ll. Inc.: Ʒeres day þe holy feste heiz day is and good.

(4) Epiphany. f. 9 A. 12 ll. Inc.: Twelfþe dai þe heze feste. nobliche is to holde.

- (5) St Hilary. f. 9 A. 94 ll. Inc.: Seint Hillare þe holi mon of Aquitayne was.
- (6) St Wolston and St Edward the King. f. 9 A. 218 ll. Inc.: Seint Wolston Bisshop of Wircestre was her of Engelonde.
- (7) St Fabian and St Sebastian. f. 10 A. 94 ll. Inc.: Seint Fabian prettene 3er Pope was in Rome.
- (8) St Agnes. f. 10 A. 126 ll. Inc.: Seint Agnes þe holy mayde wel sone heo heo bygon.
- (9) St Vincent. f. 10 B. 184 ll. Inc.: Seint Vincent in spayne was and to a cristene Bisschop cam.
- (10) St Julian Hospitaller. f. 11 A. 152 ll. Inc.: Seint Julian herbigour of noble kynde com.
- (11) St Blaize. f. 11 B. 196 ll. Inc.: Seint Blase wel clene lyf ladde wipouten hore.
- (12) St Agatha. f. 12 A. 134 ll. Inc.: Seint Agace þat gode maide in Cisyle was ibore.
- (13) St Scholastica. f. 12 B. 64 ll. Inc.: Seint Scolace þat holy mayde holy was of lyue.
- (14) St Valentine. f. 13 A. 48 ll. Seint Valentin þe martir good mon was inouh.
- (15) St Juliana. f. 13 A. 206 ll. Inc.: Seint Juliane com of heize men as we fyndeþ iwrite.
- (16) St Matthias. f. 13 B. 42 ll. Inc.: Seint mathi Apostel is as 3e schule alle iwite.
- (17) St Gregory. f. 13 B. 96 ll. Inc.: Seint Gregori þe Confessour in Cisyle was ibore.
- (18) St Longinus. f. 14 A. 46 ll. Inc.: Seint Longius was a blind kniht þo God was don on þe Roode.
- (19) St Edward King and Martyr. f. 14 A. 250 ll. Inc.: Seint Edward þe 3onge martir was kyng of Engelonde.
- (20) St Cuthbert. f. 15 A. 108 ll. Inc.: Seint Cuthberd was ibore her in Engelonde.
- (21) St Benedict. f. 15 B. 92 ll. Inc.: Seint Benet Ladde holy lyf þat was so holy mon.
- (22) St Julian the Confessor. f. 15 B. 30 ll. Inc.: Seint Julian þe confessor ibore was at Rome.
- (23) St Brigid. f. 15 B. 56 ll. Inc.: Seint Bride of wel heze men in to Scotlonde com.
- (24) St Oswald. f. 16 A. 226 ll. Inc.: Seint Oswold was ibore heere in Engelonde.
- (25) St Chad. f. 16 B. 94 ll. Inc.: Seint Chadde þe gode mon was her of Engelonde.
- (26) St Mary of Egypt. f. 17 A. 286 ll. Inc.: Seinte marie Egipcian in Egipte was ibore.
- (27) The Annunciation. f. 18 A. 24 ll. Inc.: Seinte marie day in Lente among oþur dayes gode.
- (28) The Movable Feasts. f. 18 A. 22 ll. Inc.: Festes meble þer bep icoleped fyue in þe 3ere.
- (29) Lent. f. 18 A. 226 ll. Inc.: Now bep þer. two and fourti dawes. in six wikes iwis.
- (30) Easter. f. 18 B. 54 ll. Inc.: Þe holy feste of Aster. comeþ after lenton anon.
- (31) The Ascension. f. 19 A. 4 ll. Inc.: Þe fourtiþe day þer afturward þat he aros from deþe to lyue.
- (32) The Litany. f. 19 A. 50 ll. Inc.: Letanye is a song.
- (33) The Passion. f. 19 A. 2426 ll. Inc.: Bifore six dayes of Aster as a palmsone eue.
- (34) St Alphege. f. 26 B. 224 ll. Inc.: Seint Alphe þe martir good mon was inouh.
- (35) St George. f. 27 B. 98 ll. Inc.: Seint George þe holi mon as we fyndeþ iwrite.
- (36) St Mark the Evangelist. f. 27 B. 50 ll. Inc.: Seint mark þe godspellere wyde wende aboute in londe.
- (37) St Peter the Friar Preacher. f. 27 B. 38 ll. Inc.: Seint Peter þe frere preachour in þe Cite of Veronye.
- (38) St Philip and St James. f. 28 A. 94 ll. Inc.: Seint Phelip and seint Iacob apostles weoren tweyne.
- (39) The Invention of the Holy Cross. f. 28 A. 358 ll. Inc.: Þe holy Rodē þe swete treo riht is to hauen in muynde.

(40) St Quiriac and the Holy Cross. f. 29 B. 248 ll. Inc.: Seint Quiriac þe Bisshop prechede Godus lawe.

(41) St Dunstan. f. 30 A. 156 ll. Inc.: Seint Dunston was of Engelande icome of goode more.

(42) St Aldhelm. f. 30 B. 94 ll. Inc.: Seint Aldelm þe confessour was mon of goode lyue.

(43) St Augustine. f. 31 A. 86 ll. Inc.: Seint Augustin þat cristendom brouhte into Engelande.

(44) St Petronella. f. 31 A. 90 ll. Inc.: St pernele þat holi mayde riht is to habben in muynde.

(45) St Barnabas. f. 31 B. 96 ll. Inc.: Seint Barnabe þe Apostel þat goode was and hende.

(46) St Eadburh. f. 31 B. 114 ll. Inc.: Seint Adboruh þat holi maide was here of Engelande.

(47) St Alban. f. 32 A. 94 ll. Inc.: Seint Albon þis holy mon was here of Engelande.

(48) St Aylbriht. f. 32 B. 106 ll. Inc.: Seint Aylbriht þe holy kyng kyng was of Engelande.

(49) St Etheldreda. f. 32 B. 50 ll. Inc.: Seint Aeldrede of heli god mayde was and hende.

(50) St Botulf. f. 33 A. 68 ll. Inc.: Seint Botulf þis holy monk and Adulf his broþer.

(51) St Patrick. f. 33 A. 712 ll. Inc.: Seint Patrik com þorwh God to preche in Irelande.

(52) St John the Baptist. f. 35 A. 130 ll. Inc.: Seint Iohan was þe beste bern þe holy Baptyst.

(53) St Peter the Apostle. f. 35 B. 192 ll. Inc.: Seint petre was wiþ vr lord of alle hise apostles hext. Leaf 36 B-37 A is missing. Item 53 breaks off at the foot of 36 B with: Ðauh me him do wo. The text resumes in the middle of Item 55.

(54) Missing.

(55) St Paul. f. 37 B. 250 ll. Apparently 22 lines missing at the beginning. Inc.: Aȝeyn þe prikke to wince swiþe strong is þe.

(56) St Athelwold. f. 38 A. 110 ll. Inc.: Seint Apelwold Bisschop was and in Engelande ibore.

(57) [St Swithun.] The Index gives St Oswald here; this is Item 68. f. 38 B. 158 ll. Inc.: Seint swithyan þe confessour was her of Engelande.

(58) St Kenelm. f. 39 A. 84 ll. Inc.: Seint Kenelm in Engelande was icome of goode streone.

(59) St Margaret. f. 39 A. 304 ll. Inc.: Seinte margarete an holi maide and good.

(60) St Mary Magdalene. f. 40 A. 346 ll. Inc.: Seinte marie magdaleyn þat God forȝaf hire sunne.

(61) St Mildred. f. 41 A. 152 ll. Inc.: Seint mildride þe holi mayde of kynges kunne com.

(62) St Christina. f. 41 B. 362 ll. Inc.: Seint Cristine þis holi þing as I ow telle con.

(63) St James. f. 43 A. 302 ll. Inc.: Seint Jem þe holi Apostel riht is to habben mone.

(64) St Alexius. f. 43 B. 612 ll. Inc.: Sitteþ stille wiþouten strif. and i wol tellen ou of a lyf. Ed. by C. Horstmann in *Archiv*, LV, 439-41.

(65) St Gregory. f. 44 B. 750 ll. Inc.: Alle þat ich in word and dede I þonke hit God al folkes kyng. Ed. by C. Horstmann in *Archiv*, LV, 407-38.

(66) The Seven Sleepers. f. 46 B. 160 ll. Inc.: Seue slepers were seli men as me hap on itold bifore.

(67) St Dominic. f. 47 A. 348 ll. Inc.: Seint Dominik þe noble frere in Spayne was ibore.

(68) St Oswald. f. 48 B. 44 ll. Inc.: Seint Oswold þe goode king of þat on ende of Engelande.

(69) St Christopher. f. 48 B. 220 ll. Inc.: Seint Cristofre was a Sarazin in þe lond of Canaan.

(70) St Laurence. f. 49 A. 180 ll. Inc.: Seint Laurence good mon was and in strong martirdom.

(71) St Ypolite. f. 49 B. 82 ll. Inc.: Seint Ypolyt þe martirkniht was wip gret honour.

(72) The Assumption of our Lady. f. 50 A. 294 ll. Inc.: Seinte marie godus moder fro þe Apostles was heo nouht.

(73) St Bartholomew. f. 51 A. 256 ll. Inc.: Seint Bartholomeuþ þe holi mon com of kynges blode.

(74) St Giles. f. 51 B. 126 ll. Inc.: Seint Gyles þe holi mon louede noþing sunne.

(75) St Egwin. f. 52 A. 148 ll. Inc.: Seint Egwyne þe holy mon was here of Engelande.

(76) St Matthew. f. 52 B. 108 ll. Inc.: Seint Matheu þe Ewangelist Apostel he was iwis.

(77) St Michael. f. 53 A. 300 ll. Inc.: Seint Michel þe Archaungel and hise felawas also This legend is in three parts (cf. MS. Laud 108), of which the thurd is omitted here, but appears in f. 291 A: The Right Pit of Hell.

(78) St Jerome. f. 54 A. 160 ll. Inc.: Seint Ierome was swiþe god clerk and wis þorw alle þinge.

(79) St Justine and St Ciprian. f. 54 B. 226 ll. Inc.: Seint Iustine of heige men in Antioche com.

(80) St Leger. f. 55 A. 46 ll. Inc.: Seint leger A Bisschop was an holi mon also inouh.

(81) St Francis. f. 55 A. 360 ll. Inc.: Seint Fraunceis þe Frere menour þat good mon was inouh. Here there are eight leaves missing, 56 B–64 A. 56 A ends: And as hit were men of witte þis foules he gonne preche. Catchword: Leue sutores for Godus loue. Apparently 122 lines of this item are missing.

The next eleven items are missing: (82) St Denis, (83) St Luke, (84) The Eleven Thousand Virgins, (85) St Simon and St Jude, (86) All Saints, (87) All Souls' Day, (88) St Martin, (89) St Brice, (90) St Edmund the Confessor, (91) St Edmund the King, (92) St Cecilia.

(93) St Clement. Apparently 322 lines missing at the beginning. f. 64 B begins: Allas quap þis gode mon myne leue children þreo. 226 ll.

(94) St Katherine. f. 65 A. 302 ll. Inc.: Seinte katherine of noble kunne com bi olde dawe.

(95) St Andrew. f. 66 A. 232 ll. Inc.: Seint Andreu þe apostel was seint Petres broþur.

(96) St Nicholas. f. 66 B. 484 ll. Inc.: Seint Nicholas þe holi mon þat god confessor was.

(97) St Lucy. f. 68 A. 168 ll. Inc.: Seint Lucie þe holi maide in Cicile was ibore.

(98) St Martha and St Frontoun. f. 68 B. 294 ll. Inc.: Seint Martha god wommon was as 3e schule here telle.

(99) St Thomas the Apostle. f. 69 B. 240 ll. Inc.: Seint Thomas þe gode apostel Imartred was in Inde.

(100) St Stephen. f. 70 B. 120 ll. Inc.: Seint Steuene was a Gyeu and of Gywes he com.

(101) St John. f. 71 A. 518 ll. Inc.: Seint Ion þe Ewangelist þat apostel also is.

(102) St Thomas of Canterbury. f. 72 B. 2436 ll. Apparently 121 lines lost at end. Inc.: Wolle 3e nou vndurstonde hou hit is write. The title in the Index and the item itself in the text are crossed through. Ends with f. 80 A: Ac vr lord for seint Thomas loue his grace sone on hem caste. Catchword: So þat heore fos were summe itake. Here seven leaves are missing, 80 B–87 A.

The next eleven items are missing: (103) St Silvester, (104) St Brendan, (105) St Leger, (106) St Faith, (107) St Quentin, (108) St Frideswide, (109) St Leonard, (110) St Jakes, (111) King Offa and St Fremund, (112) King Ethelbert, (113) St Anastasia.

(114)–(122) Smaller Vernon Collection. Items 114–120 edited by C. Horstmann in S.A.E.L., 1–97. The MS. from this point has three columns to the page.

(114) St Paula. f. 87 B. 247 ll. Inc. (after lost ff.): Eilþer oþur þus to cloþun and fede. S.A.E.L., pp. 1–8.

(115) St Ambrose. (De nomine Ambrosij. At l. 859 the title De Theodosio imperatore.) f. 89 A. 1130 ll. Inc.: Herkenep sires for my purpose. S.A.E.L., pp. 8-26.

(116) A Maiden of Antioch. (De quadam virgine in antiochia. At l. 181, Quedam virgo inuite in lupanari posita, seruauit pudiciam. At l. 506, De duobus veris amicis.) f. 91 A. 559 ll. Inc.: At Antioche as men han sayde. S.A.E.L., pp. 26-34.

(117) St Theodora. (De sancta Theodora.) f. 92 B. 410 ll. Inc.: At Alisaundre telle i ow con. S.A.E.L., pp. 35-41.

(118) St Bernard. f. 93 A. 1210 ll. Inc.: Seint Bernard born was at Burgoyne. S.A.E.L., pp. 41-61.

(119) St Augustine. f. 95 B. 1802 ll. Inc.: Seint Austin was nempned þat name. S.A.E.L., pp. 61-92.

(120) St Savinian and St Savina. f. 99 B. 293 ll. Inc.: Sum tyme þer was an hepen man. S.A.E.L., pp. 93-7.

(121) Barlaam and Josaphat. f. 100 A. 792 ll. Inc.: A good mon þer was and a clene. A.E.L., pp. 215 ff. f. 101 B-102 A is missing. f. 101 A begins: Til he com to his secunde frende. f. 102 B begins: I schale lete set vp verreyliche.

(122) St Euphrosyne. f. 102 B. 674 ll. Ends l. 19 of Col. 3; rest of column blank. Inc.: In Alisaundre þat grete citee. S.A.E.L., pp. 174-82; *Engl. Studien*, I, 300-11.

(123) Story of the Gospel. (Title begins: I ceste liure est escrit/[L]a estorie del Euangelie.) f. 104 B. 396 ll.; the rest missing; Inc.: Sum-while ich was wip sunne i-bounde. Ed. by C. Horstmann, *Engl. Studien*, VIII, 254-9, and E.E.T.S., 98, 1-11. Three miniatures on f. 104 B, three on 105 A. Here eight leaves are missing, 105 B-113 A.

(124) Missing.

(125) Verse Paraphrase of Psalm li. f. 113 B. 138 ll. extant, 22 missing at beginning. Inc.: So let me neuere werk bi-ginne. E.E.T.S., 98, 12-16.

(126) An Orison to the Trinity. (Her begunnep an orisun of þe trinite.) f. 113 B. 104 ll. Inc.: Fadur and Sone and holigost. E.E.T.S., 98, 16-19; Patterson, p. 82.

(127) A Confession to Jesus Christ. (A confession to Ihesu crist.) f. 114 A. 98 ll. Inc.: Swete Ihesu crist to þe. E.E.T.S., 98, 19-21; Patterson, p. 50.

(128) A Prayer to the Five Wounds. (A preyer to þe fife woundes.) f. 114 A. 16 ll. Inc.: Ihesu crist my lemmon swete. E.E.T.S., 98, 22; Patterson, p. 137.

(129) A Prayer to our Lady. (A preyer to vre ladi.) f. 114 A. 52 ll. Inc.: Marie modur and mayden. E.E.T.S., 98, 22-4; Patterson, p. 141.

(130) Two prayers at the Levation. (Title of each, A preyer at þe leuacioun.) f. 114 B. 36 ll.; 18 ll. Inc.: (A) Welcome lord in fourme of bred. (B) I þe honoure wip al my miht. E.E.T.S., 98, 24-5; B also Patterson, p. 70.

(131) Five Joys of our Lady. (Þe fyue Ioyes of vr ladi.) f. 114 B. 36 ll. Inc.: Haue Ioye marie modur and maide. E.E.T.S., 98, 25-6; Patterson, p. 144.

(132) A Prayer to God the Father. (An orisoun to god.) f. 114 B. 90 ll. Inc.: Lord my god al merciabie. E.E.T.S., 98, 26-9; Patterson, p. 122.

(133) A Prayer to God the Son. (An orisoun to vr lord Ihesu.) f. 114 B. 40 ll. Inc.: Lord Swete Ihesu crist. E.E.T.S., 98, 29-30; Patterson, p. 80.

(134) A Prayer to our Lady. f. 115 A. 56 ll. Inc.: Heil beo þu marie mylde qwen of heuene. E.E.T.S., 98, 30-2; Patterson, p. 149.

(135) Not in the text. The title perhaps refers to Item 128, which is not in the index.

(136) A Confession of Worship. f. 115 A. 16 ll. Inc.: God þat al hast mad of nought. E.E.T.S., 98, 32.

(137) A Prayer to our Lady. f. 115 A. 34 ll. Inc.: Marie modur Qwen of heuene. E.E.T.S., 98, 33; Patterson, p. 143.

(138) A Prayer for the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost. f. 115 A. 30 ll. Inc.: God þat art of mihtes most. E.E.T.S., 98, 34; Patterson, p. 128.

(139) A Confession for Negligence of the Deeds of Mercy. f. 115 A. 24 ll. Inc.: Lord I zelde me gulti. E.E.T.S., 98, 34-5.

(140) A Prayer for Saving the Five Wits. f. 115 B. 12 ll. Inc.: Lo[r]d sungez haue I ofte. E.E.T.S., 98, 35.

(141) A Confession of Negligence of the Commandments. f. 115 B. 28 ll. Inc.: Inwardliche lord biseche i þe. E.E.T.S., 98, 36.

(142) *Patris Sapiencia, or Hours of the Cross.* f. 115 B. Latin and English. 118 English ll. Inc.: *Erliehe on þe morwenyng Ihesu þe Iewes gunne take.* E.E.T.S., 98, 37-43.

(143) *Veni Creator Spiritus.* f. 116 A. Latin and English. 32 English ll. Inc.: *Cum lord vr makere holigost.* E.E.T.S., 98, 43-5.

(144) *The Sweetness of Jesus.* f. 116 A. 120 ll. Inc.: *Ihesu þi swetnesse whose miht hit se.* E.E.T.S., 98, 45-8.

(145) *A Prayer to Jesus.* f. 116 B. 32 ll. Inc.: *Ihesu þat art heuene kyng.* E.E.T.S., 98, 48-9.

(146) *Psalterium Beate Mariae (I).* f. 116 B. 1286 ll. (Translation of a poem by Albertus Magnus based on the psalms and canticles.) Inc.: *Heyl Mayden ouer Maydenes vchon.* E.E.T.S., 98, 49-105.

(147) *Salutations to our Lady.* f. 121 A. 24 ll.; 384 ll. Inc.: (A) *Mayden modur and comely Qween*; (B) *Heil beo þow marie modur of crst.* E.E.T.S., 98, 121-31.

(148) *A Prayer to the Five Wounds of Jesus.* f. 122 A. 48 ll. Inc.: *Ihesus þat dazedest vpon þe tre.* E.E.T.S., 98, 131-2; Patterson, p. 135.

(149) *A Prayer to the Five Joys of our Lady.* f. 122 A. 48 ll. Inc.: *Marie modur wel þe bee.* E.E.T.S., 98, 134-7; Patterson, p. 194.

(150) *A Salutation to our Lady.* f. 122 A. 132 ll. Inc.: *Heil beo þow marie modur and may.* E.E.T.S., 98, 134-7. Three stanzas in Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poetry* (1871), II, 283.

(151) *Psalterium Beate Mariae (II).* f. 122 B. Latin and English. 392 ll. (Paraphrase of verses ascribed to St Thomas Aquinas.) Inc.: *Heil mayde cheef of alle.* E.E.T.S., 98, 106-20.

(152)-(193) *Miracles of our Lady.* Each legend is preceded by a miniature. Items 1-9 ed. by C. Horstmann in *Archiv*, LVI, 221-36; E.E.T.S., 98. The rest are lost.

(152) *The City of Croteye.* f. 123 B. 86 ll. Inc.: *Lordus gif 3e wol lusten to me.* *Archiv*, LVI, 223-4; E.E.T.S., 98, 138-41.

(153) *The Child Slain by the Jews.* f. 124 A. 152 ll. Inc.: *Wose loueþ wel vre ladi.* *Archiv*, LVI, 224-6; E.E.T.S., 98, 141-5.

(154) *The Harlot's Prayer.* f. 124 A. 168 ll. Inc.: *God þat al þis world hap wrouht.* *Archiv*, LVI, 226-8; E.E.T.S., 98, 145-9.

(155) *The Boy in the Oven.* f. 124 B. 186 ll. Inc.: *Lord makere of alle þing.* *Archiv*, LVI, 228-31; E.E.T.S., 98, 149-54.

(156) *The Man who cut off his Foot.* f. 125 A. 74 ll. Inc.: *Iesu God and Godus Sone.* *Archiv*, LVI, 231-2; E.E.T.S., 98, 154-7.

(157) *The Virgin a Surety.* f. 125 B. 176 ll. Inc.: *At Constantynnoble in þat Cite.* *Archiv*, LVI, 232-4; E.E.T.S., 98, 157-61.

(158) *The Fornicating Priest.* f. 125 B. 78 ll. Inc.: *In Bok we fynde as we Rede.* *Archiv*, LVI, 234-5; E.E.T.S., 98, 162-4.

(159) *The Monk with the Quinsy.* f. 126 A. 80 ll. Inc.: *A mon of gret deuociun.* *Archiv*, LVI, 235-6; E.E.T.S., 98, 164-6.

(160) *The Incontinent Monk.* f. 126 A. 64 ll. extant; the rest lost. Inc.: *A sexteyn was in an abbey.* *Archiv*, LVI, 236; E.E.T.S., 98, 166-7. *Archiv*, LVI, 236; E.E.T.S., 98, 166-7. f. 126 A ends: *Whi þe sexsteyn was so long.* Catchword: *summe of hem þen gon.* Here forty leaves are missing, 126 B-166 A.

The next forty-seven items (161)-(207), including the rest of the *Miracles* and a number of prayers, etc., are lost. For the titles, see the Index.

(208)-(321) *Northern Homily Cycle.* (A) *Temporale*; (B) *Proprium Sanctorum.* The body of the work has usually the Latin heading as in the Index, and, like the Index, a separate title for the *Narratio* which usually follows the exposition of the Gospel, though the *Narratio* title is sometimes Latin in the text, English in the Index. Two titles omitted in the Index have been added from the text (234, 235), and also six titles given in the text with no homily following.

(208)-(286) *Temporale.* f. 166 B. Inc.: *Er þe folfullyng of tyme was come / Sathanas hadde al þe folk ynome.* The Gospels included are those for Sundays in the Church's year together with certain vigils, feasts and ferias. A full list will be found in A.E.L. (2), pp. lxxi-lxxii. Each homily contains a paraphrase of the Gospel for

the day, an exposition of it, and in most cases an illustrative tale. A part of each of these tales has been edited by C. Horstmann in *Archiv*, LVII, 241-316. Item 261, *Sermo in Festo Corporis Christi*, by the same editor in E.E.T.S., 98, 169-97; in *Archiv*, LXXXII, 167-88; and in part in *Archiv*, LVII, 280-1. Item 262, Seven Miracles of Corpus Christi (only six in the text), a version of Handlyng Synne 9891-10811, is printed in E.E.T.S., 98, 198-221; in *Archiv*, LXXXII, 188-97; and, in part, in *Archiv*, LVII, 282-8. Theophilus, the Narratio of Item 275, has been edited by E. Kolbing in *Engl. Studien*, I, 38-57.

(287)-(321) *Proprium Sanctorum*. f. 215 A. This contains a paraphrase of the Gospels, with exposition and sometimes illustration, for the feasts of the Church and also for two vigils. A full list will be found in A.E.L. (2), pp. lxxiv-lxxv. Items 297, 300, 303, 305, 310, 313 have nothing but the title in the text. Inc.: But greine of whete in eorpe dye. Ed. by C. Horstmann in *Archiv*, LXXXI, 83-114, 299-321.

(322) How a Man shall Live Perfectly. (Hou a man schal lyue parfytly.) f. 227 A. 1158 ll. (From the first part of *Speculum S. Edmundi*.) Inc.: In nome of hum Alwaldyng. E.E.T.S., 98, 221-51.

(323) The Visions of St Paul. (Pe visions of seynt poul wan he was rapt in to paradys.) f. 229 B. 346 ll. Inc.: Lustneþ lordynges leof and dere. E.E.T.S., 98, 25-60; ed. by R. Morris in E.E.T.S., 49, 223-32; by C. Horstmann in *Engl. Studien*, I, 293-9.

(324) *Trentalle Sancti Gregorii*. (Pe Pope trental.) f. 230 B. 200 ll. Another copy, f. 303 A, with few variants. Inc.: Writen I fynde a good stori. E.E.T.S., 98, 260-7 (with variants of Item 346); *Engl. Studien*, VIII, 275-7; critical text ed. by E. Kaufmann, *Erlanger Beiträge*, III.

(325) The Paternoster, in tabular form. Latin and English. f. 231 A.

(326) Mirror of Life. f. 231 A. 16,000 ll. Inc.: Almihti God in Trinite.

(327) Prick of Conscience. (Prikke of conciens hette þis book / Hose wole mai rede and look.) f. 264 B. 8904 ll. Miniature at the beginning. Inc.: Pe miht of þe Fader Almihti.

(328) Prick of Love. (Her beginneþ þe Prikke of loue / þat profitable is to soule behoue.) f. 283 B. 1082 ll. (A version of the *Speculum S. Edmundi*.) Inc.: God þat art of miȝtes most. Expl. Þus endeþ þe spore of loue / God grant vs þe blisse of heuene aboue. E.E.T.S., 98, 268-97.

(329) Debate between Body and Soul. (A disputacion bytwene / þe bodi and þe soule.) f. 285 B. 496 ll. Inc.: As ich say In winteres niht. Ed. by T. Wright, in *Latin Poems Attributed to Walter Mapes* (1841), pp. 334 ff.

(330) Lamentation of our Lady to St Bernard. (Her is a great lamentacion betwene vr ladi & seint Bernard / Of cristes passion hire dere sone þat was so pyneful & so hard.) f. 286 B. 736 ll. Inc.: Lewed men be not lered in lore. E.E.T.S., 98, 297-328; by G. Kribel in *Engl. Studien*, VIII, 67-114.

(331) A Disputation between a Good Man and the Devil. (A dispitison bitwene a god man and þe deuel.) f. 288 A. 987 ll. Inc.: Swiþe muche neode hit is. E.E.T.S., 98, 329-54; by C. Horstmann in *Engl. Studien*, VIII, 259-75.

(332) The Right Pte of Hell. f. 291 A. 805 ll. (The third part of the legend of St Michael; omitted in Item 77 above.) Inc.: Pe riȝte put of helle. A midde eorpe is wyt Inne.

(333) The Castle of Love. (Her byginnet a tretys / þat is yclept Castel of Loue / þat bisschop Gresteyzt made ywis / For lewede mennes by houe.) f. 292 B. 1524 ll. Inc.: Þat good þenketh good may do. E.E.T.S., 98, 355-94.

(334) Ypotis. (Her bi ginneþ a tretys þat me clepeþ Ypotys.) f. 296 A. 622 ll. Inc.: Alle ȝe þat wollep of wisdom lere. A.E.L. (2), pp. 341-8.

(335) Three Messengers of Death. f. 297 A. 224 ll. Inc.: Pe Mon þat is of wommon Ibore. E.E.T.S., 117, 443-8; ed. by C. Horstmann in *Archiv*, LXXIX, 432-4.

(336) An Orison to Christ. f. 297 B. 60 ll. Inc.: Swete Ihesu now wol I synge. E.E.T.S., 117, 449-51; Yksh. Wr. II, 9-11.

(337) Songs to our Lady. f. 297 B. 384 ll. Inc.: Marie moder mylde qween. E.E.T.S., 117, 451-62.

(338) A Little Treatise of Love. (A luytel tretys of loue / Of Godes passyon.) f. 298 B. 96 ll. Inc.: Ihesu Crist þat is so fre. E.E.T.S., 117, 462-4.

(339) Of Clean Maidenhood. (Of clene maydenhod / To be weddet clarly to god.) f. 298 B. 136 ll. Inc.: Off a trewe loue clene & derne. E.E.T.S., 117, 464-8; by F. J. Furnivall in E.E.T.S., 25, Appendix.

(340) A Mourning Song of the Love of God. (A Mournyng song / Of þe loue of God.) f. 299 A. 256 ll. Inc.: To loue I-chulle beginne. E.E.T.S., 117, 469-76.

(341) A Little Sermon of Good Edification. (Her is a luytel sarmoun þat is of good edificacioun.) f. 299 B. 80 ll. Inc.: At a sarmoun þer I seet.) E.E.T.S., 117, 476-8.

(342) Robert of Sicily. (Her is of kyng Robert of Cicyle / hou pride dude him be gyle.) f. 299 B. 444 ll. Inc.: PRinces proude þat bep in pres. S.A.E.L., pp. 209-19.

(343) A Disputation between Child Jesus and the Masters of the Law. (Her is a disputison bitwene / chi[l]d Ihesu & Maistres of þe law of lewes.) f. 300 B. 215 ll. E.E.T.S., 117, 484-93; S.A.E.L., pp. 204-8.

(344) A Disputation between a Christian and a Jew. (A disputison bitwene a / cristenemon And a Iew.) f. 301 A. 320 ll. Inc.: Alle Blþe mote þei be. E.E.T.S., 117, 484-93; S.A.E.L., pp. 204-8.

(345) How to Hear Mass. (Her techep þys tretys penne / Hou mon scholde here hys masse / Hit is ful nedful to alle menne / To more and eke to lasse.) f. 302. 688 ll. Inc.: Song & olde More and lasse. E.E.T.S., 117, 493-511; by F. Simmons in E.E.T.S., 71, 128-47; in Patterson, p. 47 (selections).

(346) Trentalle Sancti Gregorii. f. 303 A. See Item 324.

(347) Sayings of St Bernard. (Her tellez seynt Bernard / Mon hap þreo enemys hard.) f. 303 B. 216 ll. Inc.: Seint Bernard seiþ in his Bok. E.E.T.S., 117, 511-22; by H. Varnhagen in *Anglia*, III, 285-92.

(348) The King of Tars. (Her bi genneþ of þe kyng of tars / And of þe soudan of dammas / hou þw soudan of dammas / was Icristend þoru godes grace.) f. 304 A. 1122 ll. Inc.: Herkneþ now. boþe olde and 3yng. Ed. by F. Krause in *Engl. Studien*, XI, 1-62; by Ritson, *Metrical Romances*, II, 156 ff.

(349) Proverbs of Prophets, Poets and Saints. f. 306 B. 466 French and English lines. Inc.: Cher amys receuez de moy. E.E.T.S., 117, 523-53.

(350) Distichs of Cato. (Her bi-ginneþ luytel Caton. After line 112, Here endet petyt caton. Incipit liber catonis.) f. 309 A. Latin, French and English. 644 English lines. Inc.: Almihti god in Trinite. E.E.T.S., 117, 553-609; by C. Goldberg in *Anglia*, VII, 165-77.

(351) Stations of Rome. f. 313 B. 734 ll. Inc.: Lord Ihesu crist In Trinite. Prologue in E.E.T.S., 117, 609-11; rest of text ed. by F. J. Furnivall in E.E.T.S., 25, 1-24.

(352) Dispute between Mary and the Cross. f. 315 A. 512 ll. Inc.: Oure ladi freo on Rode treo. E.E.T.S., 117, 612-26; by R. Morris in E.E.T.S., 46, 131-49.

(353) Susannah. f. 316 B. 366 ll. Inc.: Per was in Babiloue a bern. E.E.T.S., 117, 626-36; by C. Horstmann in *Anglia*, I, 85-101; by F. J. Amours in *Scottish Text Society*, XXVII, 172-87, also S.T.S., XXXVIII.

(354) Charter of Christ. (Testamentum Christi.) f. 317 A. 234 ll. Inc.: Ihesu kyng of heuene and helle. Ends middle of Column 2 of 317 B; the rest of this page and the whole of 318 B blank, except for the catchword giving the title of the next item. E.E.T.S., 117, 637-57; by C. Horstmann in *Archiv*, LXXIX, 424-32; by Spalding, *Bryn Mawr Monographs*, 1914.

(355) Prick of Love. (Incipit tractatus cuius titulus dicitur Stimulus Amoris.) A version of the Stimulus Amoris ascribed to St Bonaventura. f. 318 B. 4763 ll. Inc. (after list of chapters): Al forwondred of vre self ouhte vs for to be. Expl.: Here endep þe tretis þat is cald prikke of loue, made bi a Frere menour Bonaventure þat was a Cardinal in þe Court of Rome.

(356) Nine Points Best Pleasing to God. (A tretis hou god apered to an holi mon.) f. 333 B. 30 ll. prose. Yksh. Wr. I, 110-11.

(357) Unkind man. f. 333 B. 30 ll. Inc.: Unkuinde mon. 3if kepe to me. Readings from Vernon in Yksh. Wr. I, 71.

(358) A Commandment of Love to God. (Her is a tretis þat techep to loue god. wyt al þin herte.) f. 333 B. 223 ll. Inc.: Þe Comaundement of god is þat we loue vr lord Ihesu.

(359) The Form of Perfect living. (Her beginnep þe fourme of parfytt liuyng þe w3uche holi Richard þe hermit of hampulle wrot to a recluse þat was clepet Margarete.) f. 334 A. 996 ll. Inc.: Heuerich synful mon. or wommon. Þat is bounden in dedly synne. f. 336 B, according to the actual numbering of the MS., is the recto of 369 A. But the numbering is wrong (see Introduction), as the text runs on continuously from 336 A to 336 B.

(360) Ego Dormio. f. 337 B (in MS. recto of 370, = 369 B). No title, and nothing to distinguish this from the previous item. 323 ll. Inc.: Þow þat desirest loue hold þin eren and here of loue. Ends on f. 338 B: Explicit quoddam notabile Ricardi heremite. Part ed. in Yksh. Wr. I, 57-60. Vernon variants in H. E. Allen, *English Writings of Richard Rolle*, p. 60.

(361) The Psalm 'Qui habitat' in English. (Her is a psalm of þe psauter expounded in englisch qui habitat.) f. 338 B (in MS. recto of 371 A, = 370 B.) This title is misplaced in the Index, and I have restored it to its proper position; the same applies to the title preceding this in the Index ('Of actyf and of contemplatyf lyf'), which refers to part of the 'Form'. 709 ll. Inc.: Alle men þat wol luen in þis world cristeliche.

(362) The Psalm 'Bonum est confiteri' in English. (Her is a psalm of þe psauter in Englisch Bonum est confiteri domino.) f. 340 B (the page following that numbered 372 [A]). From here to 368 A the numbering is correct. The title of this item does not appear in the Index. 549 ll. Inc.: Hit is good to schryuen to vre lord. Ends 342 A, followed by eleven blank lines and catchword: Þat þe Inner hauyng.

(363) The Scale of Perfection. (Pat þe Inner hauyng of man be lyk to þe vttur.) f. 342 B. The whole page is occupied by chapter-headings except for 19 blank lines at the end. 3229 ll. Inc. (f. 343 A): Gostly Broþer or suster in Ihesu crist. I preye þe þat in þe callyng.

(364) An Epistle on Mixed Life. (Here beginnep a luitel Boc. Pat was writen to a worldli lord. to teche him hou he schulde haue him in his state in ordeynd loue to god and to his euen cristene.) f. 353 A. 768 ll. Inc.: Whi gode desyres neodeþ to be reuled be discrecion. Yksh. Wr. I, 264-92.

(365) The Mirror of St Edmund. (Heer biginneþ a good tretis / þat seint Edmound þe Bisschop made. Iwis / þe mirour of seint Edmound Icleped hit is / þat techep mon. to heuene Blis.) f. 355 B; cf. the verse paraphrases of the same original, Items 322, 328. Inc.: Þis is þe Bok sikerly þat techep to liuen parfyttliche. Then follows a list of chapter-headings. 1159 ll. Yksh. Wr. I, 240-61.

(366) The Abbey of the Holy Ghost. (Heer biginneþ a tretis þat is clept þe Abbey of þe holygost. Pat is Conscience of monnes herte schulde ben in þis abbey most.) f. 359 A. 451 ll. Inc.: MI deore Breþren and sustren I seo wel. Readings from Vernon in Yksh. Wr. I, 321-37.

(367) The Charter of the Abbey of the Holy Ghost. (Her biginneþ þe Chartre of þis Abbeye.) f. 360 B. 788 ll. Inc.: Witteþ 3e þat beop now heere. Readings from Vernon in Yksh. Wr. I, 337-62.

(368) The Spirit of Guy. (Heer begynnep. A good tretis. / Pat men clepeþ spiritu Gwydonis.) f. 363 A. 872 ll. Inc.: For as muche. As seint Austin seiþ to Peter. Yksh. Wr. II, 292-3.

(369) A Form of Confession. (Heer is a good Confession. / Pat techep mon to sauacion / þat mon schal schriuen him here. / To techen him wel. þe manere.) f. 366 A. 268 ll. Inc.: I knowleche me gulti. And 3elde me to God Almihti. Yksh. Wr. II, 340-5.

(370) A Talking of the Love of God. (Heer is. a tretys. A talkyng of þe loue of God.) f. 367 A. 1261 ll. Inc.: Þis tretys. Is a talkyng of þe loue of God. And is mad for to sturen. hem þat hit reden. Yksh. Wr. II, 345-66.

(371) Ancren Riwe. f. 371 B. 5587 ll. The title was misplaced in the index, and is now restored to its proper position; see Introduction. Inc.: Recti diligunt te. In cantice... Louerd seiþ Godes spouse. to hire derworþe spous. Three folios (388 B-391 A) are missing near the end of the Riwe. In the course of a manuscript note on the Riwe in the Bodleian copy of Halliwell's 'Some Account of the Vernon MS.', the late G. C. Macaulay wrote: 'f. 392' (i.e. 391 B) 'we have a few lines of the "Ancren R." pp. 420, 422 of Morton, including part of a passage not in Morton's MS. but in

others. After p. 422 l. 10 of Morton's text, the Vernon copy instead of finishing the A.R. fills up the column with a passage found in the Corpus MS. only, so far as I know after p. 108 l. 17 of Morton and then adds reflections which do not belong to the A.R. at all—a new article I suppose f. 392 r. 2nd col.' (see Item 372) 'on the pains of sin and the joys of righteousness, followed by an account of the creation and of the troubles of Adam and Eve' (see Item 373) 'down to f. 394 v° where Piers Plowman begins' (13 Sept. 1913).

(372) The Pains of Sin. f. 391 B. 354 ll. Inc.: Salamon seip. In al þin werkes. þenk on þin eende and þu schalt neuere do sinne.

(373) The Life of Adam and Eve. (Þis tretys is. hou þe world was wrought and Adam and Eue. & þe wo þat adam & eue in heore lyue hedden.) f. 392 B. 473 ll. S.A.E.L., pp. 220-7.

(374) Piers Plowman. f. 394 A. 2270 ll. Inc.: In a somer sesun. whon softe was þe sonne. Ends at foot of f. 401 A: A lyf is I. hoten. hosebondes hit vsen. (The next leaf is missing.) Ed. by W. W. Skeat, Oxford, 1886. After f. 401 A there are no more red page-numbers, the numbers being now given in ink at the top of the right-hand page, so that 402 B is marked 403, and so forth. I have indicated these last pages as 403 r., 403 v., etc.

(375) Joseph of Arimathea. f. 403 r. 709 ll. Inc.: sire he seid, and sonenday is nouwe. Þenne alle lauhwen an heiz. Þat herden his wordes. Ed. by W. W. Skeat, E.E.T.S., 44.

(376) Judas and Pilate. f. 404 v. 406 ll. Inc.: Judas was a luper brid. Þat Ihesus solde to þe Rode. Ends middle of Col. 1, f. 406 r. The rest of the column is blank, and the right-hand half of the leaf has been cut off. The back of the leaf is also blank.

(377) Lyrics. E.E.T.S., 117, 658 ff.; Nos. i-xiii ed. by K. Varnhagen in *Angha*, vii, 282-315; all but xix in Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, Oxford, 1924; viii by F. J. Furnivall in E.E.T.S., 24, 106-12; xiii, xxvi and xxvii in Patterson; xx ed. by J. J. Conybeare in *Archaeologia*, xviii, 26-8.

- f. 407 r. (i) Mercy passes all things. 192 ll. Inc.: BI west vnder a wylde wode-syde.
- (ii) Deo Gracias. I. 88 ll. Inc.: In a chirche þer I con knel.
- f. 407 v. (iii) Against my Will I take my leave. 64 ll. Inc.: Nou Burnes Buirdes bolde & blyþe.
- (iv) God is Love. 56 ll. Inc.: O deore god omnipotent.
- (v) Deo Gracias. II. 48 ll. Inc.: Mi word is Deo gracias.
- (vi) Each man ought himself to know. 108 ll. Inc.: In a pistel þat poul wrought.
- f. 408 r. (vii) Think on Yesterday. 180 ll. Whon men beoþ muriest at heor mele.
- f. 408 v. (viii) Keep well Christ's Commandments. 104 ll. Inc.: I warne vche leod þat liueþ in londe.
- (ix) Who says the sooth, he shall be shent. 96 ll. Inc.: Þe mon þat luste to liuen in ese.
- (x) Fy on a faint Friend! 72 ll. Inc.: Frenschipe faileþ & fullich fadeþ.
- f. 409 r. (xi) Thank God of all. 136 ll. Inc.: Bi a wey wandryng as I went.
- (xii) This world fares as a fantasy. 132 ll. Inc.: I wolde witen of sum wys wiht.
- f. 409 v. (xiii) Ay, Mercy, God. 96 ll. Inc.: As I wandrede her bi weste.
- (xiv) Truth ever is best. 72 ll. Inc.: Hose wolde him wel avyse.
- f. 410 r. (xv) Charity is no longer dear. 112 ll. Inc.: Hose wolde biþenk him weel.
- (xvi) Of women cometh this world's weal. 120 ll. Inc.: In worchupe of þat mayden swete.
- (xvii) Mary, Mother of Christ. 104 ll. Inc.: Off alle floures feirest fall on.
- 410 v. (xviii) The Fleur de Lys, Maiden Mary. 136 ll. Inc.: Marie mayden moder mylde.
- (xix) Seldom seen is soon forgot. 112 ll. Inc.: A dere god what may pis be.

- f. 411 r. (xx) Warning to be ware. 88 ll. Inc.: Yit is god a curteis lord.
(xxi) Love Holy Church and priests. 64 ll. Inc.: Crist giue vs grace to
loue wel holichirch.
- f. 411 v. (xxii) Try to say the best. 56 ll. Inc.: Qween of heuene moder and may.
(xxiii) Tomorrow. 72 ll. Inc.: Ilke a wys wiht scholde wake.
(xxiv) Make amends for thy sins 96 ll. Inc.: Bi a wode as I gon ryde.
- f. 412 r. (xxv) Suffer in Time and that is best. 80 ll. Inc.: Whon alle soþes ben
souht and seene.
(xxvi) Mane nobiscum Domine. 80 ll. Inc.: In somer bifore þe Ascenciun.
(xxvii) A Prayer to the Virgin Mary. 168 ll. Inc.: Ave maris stella dei
mater Alma. Heil sterre of þe see so briht.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

LONDON.

HERDER'S ESSAY ON SHAKESPEARE: 'DAS HERZ DER UNTERSUCHUNG'

It is over half a century since Rudolf Haym, in his biography of Herder, produced his much-praised analysis of the essay on Shakespeare in *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*.¹ In the intervening years nothing has appeared that can possibly be held to supersede it. Walzel and Gundolf considerably narrowed down the line of approach by focusing attention on Herder's conception of original genius; the former, in his important study of the 'Prometheussymbol',² opened the eyes of scholars to a great deal of new material; while the latter, almost simultaneously, in discussing Herder's essay from the angle of Shakespeare's influence on the German mind,³ added a dazzling veneer—untarnished even by exposure to footnotes—to familiar workmanship. In this way the whole course of future research was guided into a fascinating but circumscribed field. A considerable work by G. Weber⁴ demonstrated among other things Herder's debt to English criticism, to Johnson, Young, Mrs Montagu, Home and others. Korff continued to lay stress on the irrationalist cast of his idea of creative genius,⁵ while H. Wolf, in an excellent paper, did much to clarify and extend our knowledge by showing how the wildly Promethean content of this conception gradually gave way to something more balanced and symmetrical.⁶ H. Isaacsen devoted a brief study to a comparison of the three versions of the Shakespeare essay and to Herder's translations.⁷ The wranglings, indeed, that followed in the wake of this limitation of approach—as to whether, for instance, Herder looked upon poetic creativeness as something conscious or unconscious, even as to whether he considered Shakespeare as a dramatist at all—threatened, it seemed, to become as tiresome as the quarrels of eighteenth-century Shakespearean editors and certainly distracted attention from the essay as a whole; of this Haym's majestically poised chapter still remains unquestionably the best all-round, if not exhaustive, appreciation.

One of the most tantalizing mysteries of Herder's essay, barely touched

¹ R. Haym, *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken*, I, Berlin, 1880, pp. 425 ff.

² O. F. Walzel, *Das Prometheussymbol von Shaftesbury zu Goethe*, Leipzig, 1910.

³ F. Gundolf, *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, Berlin, 1911, pp. 185 ff.

⁴ G. Weber, *Herder und das Drama*, *Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte*, 56, Weimar, 1922.

⁵ H. A. Korff, *Geist der Goethezeit*, I, Leipzig, 1923, pp. 141 ff., 151 ff.

⁶ H. Wolf, *Die Genielehre des jungen Herder*, *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, III, 1925, pp. 401 ff.

⁷ H. Isaacsen, *Der junge Herder und Shakespeare*, *Germanische Studien*, 93, Berlin, 1930.

upon hitherto, lies in the last two paragraphs, where the author states that he is about to reach the heart of the whole matter, only to break off with an enthusiastic greeting to the poet of *Götz von Berlichingen*.¹ In what was the 'Herz der Untersuchung' to consist? and why was it not given? Does it appear in any other work, from which it may possibly be reconstructed? Are we to consider everything that precedes—that inspired comparison of the English, French and Greek theatres, and those much-discussed passages on Shakespeare's genius—as nothing more than an introduction to Herder's real thoughts, which he left unspeakable? The answer to all this may shed light on the wider issue of the source of Herder's interest in Shakespeare—why did it blaze up so suddenly at this time, only to burn itself out, seemingly? Can there be any connexion between its growth and the study of Ossian and Percy, who provided the subject-matter of that other essay of his in *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*?

The two paragraphs referred to, strangely neglected as they have been, contain the real key to Herder's ideas. He defines what the heart of the essay is to be, as follows:

Nun finge eben das Herz meiner Untersuchung an, 'wie? auf welche Kunst und Schöpferweise *Shakespear* eine elende Romanze, Novelle, und Fabelhistorie zu solch einem lebendigen Ganzen habe dichten können? Was für Gesetze unsrer *Historischen, Philosophischen, Dramatischen Kunst* in Jedem seiner Schritte und Kunstgriffe liege?' Welche Untersuchung! wie viel für unsern Geschichtsbau, Philosophie der Menschenseelen und Drama.—Aber ich bin kein Mitglied aller unsrer Historischen, Philosophischen und schonkünstlerischen Akademien, in denen man freilich an jedes Andre eher, als an so etwas denkt! Selbst *Shakespears* Landsleute denken nicht daran. Was haben ihm oft seine Kommentatoren für Historische Fehler gezeihet! der fette *Warburton*, z. B. welche Historische Schönheiten Schuld gegeben! und noch der letzte Verfasser des *Versuchs über ihn* hat er wohl die Lieblingsidee, die ich bei ihm suchte: 'wie hat *Shakespear* aus Romanzen und Novellen Drama gedichtet?' erreicht? Sie ist ihm wie dem Aristoteles dieses Brittischen Sophokles, dem *Lord Home*, kaum eingefallen.'²

One point in this programme is perfectly clear: Herder proposes to examine Shakespeare's use of popular ballads and traditions, of 'elende Romanzen, Novellen und Fabelhistorien'. This will, it seems, form the basis of further reflexions; though the exact meaning of Herder's words is characteristically elusive, and even when apparently well within our grasp its irrepressible vitality assumes fresh and perplexing tints. We must seize quickly upon each point before it escapes us. A study of the manner in which Shakespeare's genius operated and transformed his ballad material is one—Herder's second point, then—and is implied in the terms 'Schöpferweise' and 'Philosophie der Menschenseelen'; his third is the value of Shakespeare's example in the field of the drama. A

¹ *Herders sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. von B. Suphan (*SWS.*), v, pp. 229 ff.

² *SWS.*, v, pp. 229.

fourth does not crystallize out so readily and its exact nature does not become clear without further information: it may be described, vaguely for the moment, as Shakespeare's relationship to history.

The second of these themes has already been discussed at length. The third and fourth have been more lightly treated.¹ But the first—Herder's 'Lieblingsidee', as he expressly declares—has been brushed aside with little or no serious attention, though upon it the other lines of approach will be seen to depend. To understand how it came to be Herder's main topic of interest, it is necessary to pass in brief review the genesis of his Shakespearean studies—another matter to which little space has been devoted since the time of Haym and of Minor and Sauer.²

It was Hamann, of course, here, as in other fields, who had led Herder to Shakespeare, in those early lessons in 1764 when they read *Hamlet* together.³ In Riga he had made himself thoroughly at home with as much of Shakespeare as he could, remaining, however, only slightly acquainted with the historical plays.⁴ After *Hamlet*, with which Herder reveals closest familiarity, Hamann's other favourites, the *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Tempest* and *Macbeth*, are the plays he quotes most frequently, with *Timon of Athens* and *Julius Caesar* making occasional appearances in his works. In the *Fragmente*, *Hamlet* alone is actually quoted in English, *Macbeth* following in the second *Wäldchen* in 1769, and it is safe to assume that, before this date, Herder knew very little indeed of the English text, except *Hamlet* which he had practically by heart. These scattered references are accompanied by very little more than passing words of admiration, especially for Shakespeare's use of the native linguistic resources,⁵ and it is in the Riga writings taken as a whole, rather than in such isolated specific observations, that the flashing thrusts of the Shakespeare essay of 1773 are foreshadowed. As in the case of Ossian, Herder was still too imperfectly informed to allow himself any far-reaching judgements; and when it is remembered that even the very slightest impression could give rise within him to thoughts of 'gothic' proportions, his silence is all the more significant. He relied no doubt almost entirely on Wieland's translation.⁶ In 1767 he is seen to be seeking a text of Shakespeare,⁷ and he seems to have been without a complete English

¹ By H. Isaacsen, op. cit., and by R. Stadelmann, *Der historische Sinn bei Herder*, Halle, 1928, esp. pp. 139 ff.

² R. Haym, op. cit., *passim*, and J. Minor and A. Sauer, *Studien zur Goethe-Philologie*, Vienna, 1880, pp. 239 ff.

³ On Hamann's view of Shakespeare cf. R. Unger, *Hamann und die Aufklärung*, Jena, 1911, I, pp. 263, 309 ff.

⁴ J. Minor and A. Sauer, op. cit., p. 240 n.

⁵ *SWS.*, I, p. 162; II, p. 45.

⁶ On this cf. *SWS.*, I, p. 217.

⁷ *Herders Briefe an J. G. Hamann*, hrsg. von O. Hoffmann, Berlin, 1889, p. 35.

version until early in 1769, when he obtained through Hartknoch's good offices a copy of the Johnson edition of 1765¹—an acquisition of the utmost importance. But even then there was still lacking the vital spark that would convert his rising interest into a raging passion. The explanation is not far to seek.

Herder's widow laid her finger on the root of the whole matter, when she wrote, in a much quoted and loosely understood passage:

Seine Bekanntschaft mit diesem Dichter [Shakespeare] und mit Ossian entwickelten seine eigenthumliche Sympathie und vorherrschende Liebe zur einfach-ruhrenden Natursprache der Volkslieder, deren Keim durch die morgenländische Poesie schon in früher Jugend in ihm geweckt worden war.²

Every word in this important passage needs pondering, as in it is clearly indicated the whole genealogy of Herder's literary criticism. First the Bible, at home in Mohrungen, at the University and with Hamann; then the folk-song; then Shakespeare and Ossian together—in that sequence—rose up before him and engrossed his attention, the one leading naturally to the other, which in turn helped to fertilize and sustain his interest in what had gone before.

In view of this, it follows that for Herder's vision of Shakespeare to develop, not only closer familiarity with the poet himself was necessary, but also an extension of his view of the folk-song. For these two—Shakespeare and the folk-song—were more intimately connected in his mind than anyone, since Caroline gave her opinion, has fancied. Where critic after critic, inexplicably it now seems, has done little more than graze the edge of the problem in passing, she pointed the way to its very heart, by insisting on the chronological stages in the growth of her husband's opinion, and she was in the best possible position to know the workings of his mind, most of all in the sphere of the folk-song, which fascinated her more than any other branch of his work. It is erroneous, then, to assume, as is so often tacitly assumed—despite the universal recognition of the irrationalist cast of Herder's mind—that a piece of theoretical reasoning was involved. Shakespeare was not aligned with the folk-song and was not given a prominent place in the *Volkslieder* of 1774 and 1778–9, merely because this was the prerogative of all great creative geniuses. When, for instance, Kühnemann writes:

Dass Shakespeare zwischen den Volksliedern steht, verwundert uns nicht mehr. Seine Dichtungen sind für Herder naturgewachsene Schöpfungen wie die Lieder des

¹ Op. cit., p. 53. By 1776 he also possessed the Warburton and Theobald editions (cf. the manuscript '*Meine Bücher, den 21. Jun. 1776*', f. 14).

² Maria Carolina von Herder, *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben Joh. Gottfrieds von Herder*, Tübingen, 1820, I, p. 64. In face of this statement it is a little difficult to account for Gundolf's assertion of the direct opposite, op. cit., p. 220: H. Isaacsen, op. cit., p. 88, merely echoes Gundolf and misquotes Caroline in support! Cf. also *SWS.*, v, pp. 169f., where Herder derives his enthusiasm for Ossian ultimately from his early experiences of the folk-song.

Volks. Sein Anteil an den Volksliedern, an Shakespeare und Ossian ist ganz derselbe er kann sie kaum unterscheiden. . . . Er empfindet und erkennt an ihnen allen auf die gleiche Weise, wie wahrhaftes Leben zur Dichtung wird.¹

he merely states a part of the truth—looking at the question from the second of Herder's four angles of approach—and assumes the process of theoretical reasoning just mentioned. A tendency to strain the meaning of 'Volkslied', or to insist on one special aspect, the 'organic' aspect, to the exclusion of others, is not absent, even in this passage, and it raises its head well above the surface in Gundolf's chapter, which further assumes that Herder himself strained the meaning of this word.² To such limits are critics driven in order to explain Herder's linking of Shakespeare with the folk-song, when they ignore Caroline's hint that the genetical approach is the only true one. For Shakespeare was wedded to what had been from the very beginning one of the major themes in his literary criticism—the origin of poetry generally. From Herder's studies of this latter there emerged substance so fruitful that it caused his vision of Shakespeare to swell rapidly to 'gothic' proportions and sweep him and his immediate hearers and readers completely off their feet.

In the course of that famous journey from Riga to Bückeburg Herder's theory of the lyrical basis of the epic was steadily assuming a coherent, if not yet final form. The Homeric and Ossianic poems were, in his eyes, the songs of 'Volksdichter', ballads relating to national legend and tradition, which had been collected and fused together into the longer units the world knew. The early chapters of the Old Testament were no exception. So sure was Herder of his footing, indeed, that he took the beginning of the book of Genesis and isolated what he thought to be the original ballads from which it had grown, actually rewriting these in typical ballad metre and style.³ Though he did not say so outright—indeed, even in regard to the epic, his thoughts were not actually published to the world until over twenty years later—it is impossible to escape the impression that he was intensely occupied at the same time by the thought that the drama—Shakespeare—might similarly be the outcome of simple ballad beginnings, that the playwright might have dramatized popular lyrical romances, as the epic writer combined them. Herder was now, moreover, constantly coming upon important evidence of the ballad affiliations of Shakespeare, and it is not without significance that the Shakespeare essay was ultimately composed and published in close association with that on Ossian and Percy. And it was, in fact, in

¹ E. Kuhnemann, *Herder*, Munich, 1927⁸, p. 273. Cf. also G. Weber, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 ff.

² Gundolf, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

³ A. Gillies, *Herder und Ossian, Neue Forschung*, 19, Berlin, 1933, pp. 60 f. and 128 ff.

Percy that the whole key to Shakespeare lay. As Herder's knowledge of the *Reliques* increased, so did his conception of Shakespeare become more definite and move towards its startling culmination. It was a conception that came of steady growth and long preparation.

As early as 1766 Herder's attention was directed, by Raspe's memorable review of the *Reliques* in the *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*, to the 'ballads that illustrate Shakespeare'¹ and to Percy's essay on the English theatre.² A passage such as the following—which, incidentally, more than hints at the relativity of aesthetic norms—must, indeed, have put his sensitive mind into a state of almost inconceivable agitation:

Chaucer, Shakespeare und alle, die semen Fusstapfen (!) gefolgt sind, haben . . . auf diese Lieder, die vor Zeiten der Zeitvertreib und die Lust der grossten Manner waren, theils hundert Anspielungen gemacht, theils auch sich mit vielen daraus erborgten Federn geschmucket, oder durch ihre Schonheit zu einem ähnlich schonen Enthusiasmus hinreissen lassen. Der Herausgeber hat daher oft Gelegenheit, den armen Shakespear aus diesen Balladen gegen die oft unbarmherzigen Kritiken eines Theobald und Pope zu rechtfertigen und zu erklären, wie er denn im ersten Bande eine ganze Reihe Balladen that illustrate Shakespear hat abdrucken lassen, die er mit einer lehrreichen Abhandlung uber das englische Theater begleitet hat. Von letzterer wünschten wir, dass sie allen unsern Kunsttrichtern, besonders den jungern bekannt seyn mochte. Sie wurden daraus lernen, dass die franzosischen Regeln des Schauspiels nicht die einzigen sind; dass die Mysteries, Moralities, Masks, Histories, Comedies auch Tragedy's (!) ihre eignen Regeln haben, und dass es eben so ungerecht seyn wurde, Shakespear, der oft nur eine dramatische Historie hat schreiben wollen, nach denen ihm unbekannten neuen franzosischen Regeln zu beurtheilen, als wenn man die Geschichtschreiber Tacitus, Livius und Hume darum tadeln wollte, weil sie in ihrer Erzählung nicht so einfach und ungeschmucket sind als die neuern Romanschreiber seyn sollen.³

There was a vital reason, therefore, for Raspe's urgent appeal for a German Percy.⁴ When Herder read in this same journal⁵ that Raspe's *Hermin und Gunilde*—besides being written in the traditional 'Romanzenton'—was constructed on the basis of a popular local tradition, he needed very little imagination to form the opinion that popular substance might similarly have served as the foundation of Shakespearean drama. Even at this early date he remarked upon Shakespeare's use of English history, though without enlarging on this point in his published writings.⁶ If it be remembered that about this same time Herder was occupied with Jacquet's *Parallèle des Tragiques Grecs et Français* (Lille, 1760)—it was

¹ *Reliques*, vol. I, bk. 2 (1765 edition, I, pp. 117 ff.).

² 1765 ed., I, pp. 118 ff. On the introduction of Percy into Germany cf. H. F. Wägenar, *Das Eindringen von Percys Reliques in Deutschland*, Diss. Heidelberg, 1897, and H. Lohre, *Von Percy zum Wunderhorn*, *Palaestra*, 22, Berlin, 1902.

³ *Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften*, II, 1766, pp. 62 f.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 88 f.

⁵ III, 1766, pp. 118 ff. Herder possessed these volumes (*Bibliotheca Herdervana, Vimarinae*, 1804, p. 264): *SW*, II, p. 188 (*Fragmente*, second edition) refers to them directly, for Weisse's review of Ossian appeared in them as well.

⁶ *SW*, XXXII, p. 142.

announced he was translating it¹—it will be seen that the material from which the thoughts of the 1773 essay grew was early in his hands, if not yet in a form that could satisfy him.

Herder's irritation, indeed, at being unable, for lack of the necessary books and information, to follow up this important new point Raspe had raised, can only have been equalled by his dissatisfaction with Wieland's German Shakespeare. But Johnson's edition, which he acquired early in 1769, shed new light on his problem. It may be noted in passing that this edition, with its reprint of the prefaces of Pope, Theobald, Hanmer, Warburton and Rowe, was an excellent introduction into contemporary Shakespearean scholarship in England and all its endless bickerings. There were many references to Shakespeare's use of popular tradition. 'His English histories he took from English chronicles and *English ballads*',² was one observation of Johnson's that must have resounded over and over again in Herder's eagerly receptive mind, coming from so celebrated and so hard-headed an authority. Theobald, too, remarks on Shakespeare's treatment of 'translations, romances and legends, started about his time and a little before'. But a note such as that added by Warton to the *Merchant of Venice*, could have only one effect on Herder's quick imagination.

The antient ballad [wrote Warton] on which the greater part of this play is probably founded has been mentioned in *Observations on the Fairy Queen*, i, 129. Shakespeare's track of reading may be traced in the common books and popular stories of the times, from which he manifestly derived most of his plots. Historical songs, then very fashionable, often suggested and recommended a subject. Many of his incidental allusions also relate to pieces of this kind: which are now grown valuable on this account only, and would otherwise have been deservedly forgotten. A ballad is still remaining on the subject of *Romeo and Juliet*, which by the date appears to be much older than Shakespeare's time. It is remarkable, that all the particulars in which that play differs from the story in *Bandello*, are found in this ballad. But it may be said that he copied this story as it stands in *Paynter's Pallace of Pleasure*, 1567, where there is the same variation of circumstances. This, however, shews us that Shakespeare did not first alter the original story for the worse, and it is at least a presumptive proof that he never saw the *Italian*.

Continuing, Warton refers to 'an ingenious enquirer into our older English literature, who is now publishing a curious collection of antient ballads, which will illustrate many passages in Shakespeare',³ and concludes: 'I doubt not but he received the hint of writing on King Lear from a ballad of that subject.'⁴ It is unlikely that the note of caution in this statement passed over with the meaning into Herder's mind. For him there could be but one inference.

¹ *SWS.*, xxxii, pp. 140-4 and note, p. 535.

² The italics in this and in the following quotation from Theobald are mine.

³ Cf. Percy's note on 'Gernutus, the Jew of Venice', *Reliques*, 1765 edition, i, p. 190.

⁴ Johnson's *Shakespeare*, viii, Appendix, note to i, p. 488; cf. Percy, 1765, i, p. 211, and the passage referred to in *Observations on the Fairy Queen*.

It would, moreover, be no less clear to Herder from his study of this edition that Shakespeare in his turn was fused into the native poetic tradition on which he drew. The very fact that the text was so obviously a matter of dispute would put him for Herder into line with the folk-song, with its varied and uncertain textual history. The poet himself, in the true manner of a popular minstrel, cared little or nothing, Herder was told, about the collection and publication of his works; the numerous editions, 'clandestine or professed', as Johnson put it, and the never-ending disputes as to the genuineness of some of the plays attributed to him, unedifying enough to an opponent of rationalist criticism, represented in themselves important evidence in the same direction. Theobald's account of the genesis of the first folio, which he described as the result of many scattered fragments culled from all kinds of sources, often taken down from actual performances in the theatres—from oral tradition, as would have been said in the case of folk-songs—with the inevitable multiplication and propagation of errors and amendments, corresponded exactly to the vision Herder was forming of the origin of the Homeric epics, the complete works as we know them being composite products by later hands. So that the real Shakespeare was nothing like the Shakespeare presented by the editors, just as the real Homer was far more of a minstrel, an improvisator and ballad-monger than the commentators would suggest. Percy's *Reliques*, when Herder saw them, revealed how several traditional versions of the same poem could exist side by side and how indefinite the textual question really could be.

It was precisely at this stage in his authorship in 1769 that Herder's blood reached boiling point over Denis' mishandling of Ossian. His thoughts were turned more forcibly than ever to the lyrical beginnings of all literature. His impatience was fed, in the seclusion of his stay at Nantes, by a collection of articles from the *Journal Étranger* and the *Gazette Littéraire* which came his way—the *Variétés Littéraires* (Paris, 1768–9). This work contributed considerably to the evolution of his thoughts on Ossianic poetry, and Herder did not fail to stress its value to him in his letters to Hamann and Hartknoch.¹ But in addition to Ossianic translations and essays, there were in these four volumes an 'Essai historique sur l'origine et les progrès du théâtre anglois', an 'Essai sur les anciens ménestrels, traduit de l'anglois' and 'Observations sur Shakespeare, tirées de la Préface que M. Johnson a mise à la tête d'une

¹ *Herders Briefe an J. G. Hamann*, hrsg. von O. Hoffmann, Berlin, 1889, p. 63; *Herders Lebensbild*, hrsg. von E. G. von Herder, Erlangen, 1846, II, p. 36. Cf. also A. Gillies, *op. cit.*, pp. 19 f.

nouvelle édition des œuvres de ce poète'.¹ Of the two 'essais', the former is a fairly full translation of Dodsley's preface to his *Select Collection of Old Plays* (1744): its data on the pre-Shakespearean stage, the strolling players, inn-shows, interludes, masques, moralities, etc., would no doubt be most welcome to Herder, so that his genetical method of criticism, when applied to Shakespeare, was not left without any material basis. It was now easy for him to place Shakespeare in the direct line of descent from the minstrels and ballad-mongers, and these Percy's 'Essay on the Ancient English Minstrels' (of which the second 'essai' was an extract) showed to be the successors of the scalds and bards. From Ossian and the scops and minstrels there was, for Herder, a regular genealogical tree.

For the picture to be completed, it was only necessary that the *Reliques* should be actually studied in the original. For this Herder had to wait until August 1771, when Raspe obligingly lent him his copy.² In the meantime he had read more and more deeply into Shakespeare; in Strassburg he had developed a veritable mania for him and his letters to Caroline swarm with references. Yet for all that, he was unable to make any real progress, when he sat down to write his essays on Ossian and Shakespeare in July 1771.³ The *Reliques* alone saved the situation and made possible the composition of *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst* as we know it; the Ossian essay being rapidly finished in the early autumn, that on Shakespeare, after two revisions, ultimately remaining a fragment.

A mere cursory glance at the section in the *Reliques* to which Raspe had drawn attention, the 'Ballads that illustrate Shakespeare'—ballads 'quoted by Shakespeare or (which) contribute in any degree to illustrate his writings',⁴ 'our great dramatic poet having occasionally quoted ancient ballads, and even taken the plot of one, if not more of his plays from among them'⁵—must have been sufficient to dispel every shadow of doubt and anxiety, if any still lingered in Herder's mind. Here was practical confirmation of the idea that had constantly haunted him. It

¹ I, pp. 26 ff.; III, pp. 462 ff.; IV, pp. 65 ff., respectively.

² *Weimarisches Jahrbuch*, III, 1855, p. 42 and *Von und an Herder*, hrsg. von H. Düntzer und F. G. von Herder, Leipzig, 1861-2, III, p. 286. Raspe's copy, in view of his essays of 1766, was doubtless the first edition, 1765. Lambel (*Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*, D.L.D., 40/41, Stuttgart, 1892, p. viii) would infer from Herder's remark to Raspe: 'Meine wenige (') Bücher sind noch in Liefland', that he already possessed a copy himself, in contradiction to the statements in letters to Hamann (*Herders Briefe an Hamann*, pp. 68, 89). Herder did acquire a copy of the 1767 edition, but after he had used Raspe's copy (*Bibliotheca Herderiana*, p. 291 and *Briefe an Hamann*, p. 68).

³ *Herders Briefwechsel mit Caroline Flachsland*, hrsg. von Hans Schauer, Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 39, 41, Weimar, 1926-8, I, p. 266 and note, pp. 463 ff.

⁴ 1765 edition, I, p. 118.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 117.

is not without significance that it was with Raspe that Herder exchanged opinions on the lyrical origins of the epic; indeed it was in the very letter accompanying the *Reliques* that Raspe declared it to be his conviction that Homer and Ossian had been 'stückweise, durch Rhapsodisten erhalten und nach verschiedenen Jahrhunderten zu verschiedenen Malen und auf verschiedene Weise zusammengesetzt',¹ in which Herder unreservedly concurred when he returned the book in the following year.² Such poems as 'Gernutus, the Jew of Venice', 'Titus Andronicus' Complaint', 'King Leir and his Three Daughters', for instance, with Percy's notes on them, offered positive proof, to one so full of this thought, of the manner in which Shakespearean drama grew from ballad substance. Percy's refusal to commit himself, in the case of 'King Leir and his Three Daughters', as to whether the poem or the play came first, would have little weight with Herder; his argument would not suffer, indeed, if the ballad were discovered to be founded on the play, for that would be one more proof that Shakespeare, besides building on popular tradition, himself became part of it. There were, moreover, many poems which Percy remarked had been quoted or alluded to by Shakespeare and his contemporaries, e.g. 'Willow, Willow, Willow',³ 'My Mind to me a Kingdom is',⁴ 'Take those Lips away',⁵ 'The aged Lover renounceth Love',⁶ and others. No wonder Herder wrote so enthusiastically at the very outset of the Ossian-essay of that 'old and antik song', 'Come away, Come away, Death'—'eins der alten Lieder die in Shakespear...vorkommen'—and quoted with obvious delight:

... it is old and plain;
The spinsters and the knitters in the sun,
And the free maids that weave their threads with bones,
Do use to chant it.⁷

¹ *Von und an Herder*, III, p. 286.

² *Wenmarisches Jahrbuch*, III, p. 44.

³ Versions of this were contained in the *Volksheder* of 1774 and 1778-9 (*SWS.*, xxv, pp. 57, 287; cf. also p. 632).

⁴ Cf. *SWS.*, v, p. 199; Herder translated this poem but did not include it in his *Volksheder*. The song is mentioned by Ben Jonson in *Every Man out of his Humour*, I, I.

⁵ Cf. *SWS.*, xxv, pp. 58, 204 (*Volksheder* of 1774 and 1778-9); Herder's version of the first stanza, *ibid.*, p. 204 n. The first stanza occurs in *Measure for Measure*, IV, I, the second in Fletcher's *The Bloody Brother*, v, II.

⁶ Percy (1765, I, p. 161) notes that the gravedigger's song in *Hamlet* is taken from three stanzas of this poem, 'though somewhat altered and disguised, as the same were corrupted by the ballad-mongers of Shakespeare's time'—an observation that would be duly noted by Herder!

⁷ *SWS.*, v, p. 162. In addition, the poem was included in the *Volksheder* of 1774 and 1778-9 and in the *Silbernes Buch* (*SWS.*, xxv, pp. 58, 289). Of it Herder wrote to Merck: 'Es ist eine alte Romanze, weit älter als Shakespear und so auch die 'take, oh take'. Solche alte Lieder sind für mich von der Wirkung, dass ich mir fest vorgenommen, dass, wenn ich je an die britische Küste komme, ich nur durchfliege, Theater und Garrick sehe, Hume grüsse, und dann nach Wales und Schottland und in die westlichen Inseln, wo auf einer Macpherson, wie Ossians jungster Sohn sitzt'. (*Herders Lebensbild*, III, p. 230 and *Briefe an Joh. H. Merck*

Nor can he have passed by indifferently certain pointed remarks in Percy's introductions, such as that on historical plays in the 'Essay on the Origin of the English Stage':

What might contribute to make dramatic poetry take this turn [i.e. that of historical drama] was, that soon after the mysteries ceased to be exhibited, there was published a large collection of poetical narratives, called the *Mirror for Magistrates*, wherein a great number of the most eminent characters in English history are drawn relating their own misfortunes. This book was popular and of a dramatic cast and therefore, as an elegant writer has well observed, might have its influence in producing Historic plays. These narratives probably furnished the subjects and the ancient Mysteries suggested the plan.¹

It is hardly necessary to interpolate, perhaps, that we are occupied here only with the facts concerning Shakespeare's sources as they presented themselves to Herder; there is no purpose in commenting on them from the standpoint of modern research into Elizabethan literature. It should be noted, moreover, that Herder, convinced as he must have been that the English dramatists were the legitimate successors of the minstrels, as these were of the scalds and bards, was nevertheless far from overlooking the place of the mysteries and moralities in the growth of the theatre. But then these, too, were 'popular', in Herder's sense, and his argument would not be affected.²

The main line Herder proposed to take in the continuation of the Shakespeare essay now becomes clear. His 'Lieblingsidee' had had ample preparation and it is not difficult to see how it would have developed. The analogy of Shakespeare with Homer, Ossian and the Old Testament was perfect. Just as the Homeric epics had arisen, as Herder pointed out—significantly enough—in the preface to the *Volklieder*,³ from collected folk-songs, and Ossian from short lyrical fragments (whether fitted together by Ossian himself or by Macpherson he was still undecided, and anyway it was beside the point);⁴ just as the first chapters of *Genesis* grew from a number of single popular ballads, into which he actually found it possible to resolve them; and just as, even in the

von Goethe, Herder, Wieland und andern bedeutenden Zeitgenossen, hrsg. von K. Wagner, Darmstadt, 1835, p. 14). Apart from the confusion of English and Celtic (cf. A. Gillies, op. cit., pp. 26, 38 f.), the connexion is clear; Herder will first see the English drama and then hear the ballads from which it grew!

¹ 1765, I, p. 126f. As to the dependence of Elizabethan literature on the mediaeval ballads, Herder no doubt remember that Thomas Warton, in his *Observations on the Fairy Queen of Spenser* (1754), had devoted a whole chapter to 'Spenser's imitations from old romances', and draw his conclusions accordingly.

² An unassuming footnote of Percy's no doubt clinched matters: 'It would seem that the Minstrels set off their singing by mimicry or action: or, according to Dr Brown's hypothesis, united the powers of melody, poem and dance' (1765, I, p. xxvn.). Cf. H. M. Flasdieck, *John Brown (1715-66) und seine Dissertation on Poetry and Music. Studien zur englischen Philologie*, 68, Halle, 1924; also W. Nüfer, *Herders Ideen zur Verbindung von Poesie, Musik und Tanz*, Germanische Studien, 74, Berlin, 1929.

³ *SWS.*, xxv, p. 314.

⁴ A. Gillies, op. cit., *passim*.

Reliques, as Percy himself admitted,¹ at least one poem was the outcome of the editor's welding together of scattered stanzas; so the plays of Shakespeare were, in his eyes, often dramatizations of traditional romance material. Herder twice refers to this as his principal contribution to Shakespearean criticism.² The likeness between Shakespeare and Sophocles, which is insisted on in the essay, was for him even closer than has been supposed: for if the Greek drama grew from native dithyrambic hymns, Shakespeare's grew from native folk-songs, such as Percy had published to the world.

And the transition from lyric to drama was an easy one, in Herder's view. In the Ossian essay he writes, for instance:

Die Anmerkung, die Sie 'über das *Dramatische in den alten Liedern*' dieser Art machen, ist so nach meinem Sinn, dass ichs mir immer mit unter den Charakterstücken der Alten gedacht habe, die wir Neuere so wenig erreichen, als ein todes momentarisches Gemälde eine fortgehende, handelnde, lebendige Scene. Jenes sind unsre Oden; dies die Lyrischen Stücke der Alten, insonderheit wilder Völker. Alle Reden und Gedichte derselben sind Handlung.³

This is by no means an isolated statement of opinion.

The full force of Caroline's statement that Herder's love of the folk-song was responsible for the growth of his unique enthusiasm for Shakespeare now becomes clear; and it is perfectly understandable why Shakespeare had so prominent a place in the *Volkshieder*, particularly the 1774 collection. No straining of meaning, no postulation of deductive theorizing is necessary to explain this fact. Indeed, it is true, though not the whole truth, to say that Herder studied Shakespeare because he sprang from the folk-song (not, then, simply, because he *was* folk-song), and the folk-song because of the light it shed on Shakespeare's achievement, his use of sources, its reverberations in his works. As Warton had already pointed out,⁴ even the most insignificant songs acquire importance if it is known that Shakespeare utilized them. Together, the folk-song and Shakespeare afforded a compelling illustration, moreover, of the way in which literature should naturally progress. Indeed, the whole of English literature was the organic outcome of popular lyrical substance.

Die grössten Sanger und Gunstlinge der Musen [declared Herder] *Chaucer* und *Spenser*, *Shakespeare* und *Milton*, *Philipp Sidney* und *Selden*—was kann, was soll ich alle

¹ 'Dispersed thro' Shakespeare's plays are innumerable little fragments of ancient ballads, the intire copies of which could not be recovered. Many of these being of the most beautiful and pathetic simplicity, the Editor was tempted to select some of them, and with a few supplemental stanzas to connect them together and form them into a little tale, which is here submitted to the Reader's candour' ('The Friar of Orders Gray', 1766, I, p. 225): which places Percy in exactly the position in which Macpherson, in the dissertation prefaced to *Temora*, confessed he was (*Temora*, London, 1763, p. xviii); Macpherson's confession was known to Herder from Denis' translation.

² *SWS.*, v, p. 229.

³ *SWS.*, v, pp. 176 f.

⁴ In Johnson's *Shakespeare*, VIII, Appendix, note to I, p. 488.

nennen? waren *Enthusiasten der alten Lieder*, und der Beweis wäre nicht schwer, dass das *Lyrische*, *Mythische*, *Dramatische* und *Epische*, wodurch sich die Englische Dichtkunst *national* unterscheidet, aus diesen alten Resten alter Sanger und Dichter entstanden sey. Von *Chaucer*, *Spenser*, *Shakespear* darfs keines Beweises, und selbst bis auf *Dryden*, *Addison* und *Pope*, den letzten fast schon zu zarten Sprossen der Englischen Dichtkunst verbreitet sich noch wenigstens *Liebhabelei* dieser Stucke und Nachahmung.¹

Moreover, such poets being steeped in popular tradition, were themselves merged into it in their turn. Shakespeare was the creator of new folk-songs as well as the user of old ones; and Herder had the double task before him of isolating such new lyrical snatches as well as folk-song echoes. Hence, 'Full fathom five', 'Under the Greenwood Tree' and others are placed by him alongside 'Youth and Age', 'Willow, Willow, Willow' and similar poems from the *Reliques* which illustrated Shakespeare. There is, then, a very real reason in Herder's remark that the folk-songs were 'mehr wie Materialien zur Dichtkunst, als dass sie Dichtkunst selbst wären'.²

It is primarily in Herder's prefaces and notes to the *Volkslieder* that the substance no doubt intended for the continuation of the Shakespeare essay must be sought, and especially in the article 'Von Ähnlichkeit der mittleren englischen und deutschen Dichtkunst' of 1777, which was first written as the preface to Part II of the *Volkslieder* of 1774, almost immediately after the essay on Shakespeare. In this article, Herder summed up the whole matter as clearly as he was able, and attempted to answer the question why Germany had not had a Shakespeare, as might have been expected in view of racial affinity and the possession of an originally common mythology and language. This was one of the most profound and influential contributions Herder made to literary criticism.

Wenn nun auch hier [he wrote] England und Deutschland grosse Gemeinschaft haben, wie weiter wären wir, wenn wir diese Volksmeinungen und Sagen auch so gebraucht hätten, wie die Britten und unsre Poesie so ganz darauf gebaut wäre, als dort *Chaucer*, *Spenser*, *Shakespear* auf Glauben des Volks baueten, daher schufen und dahernahmen. Wo sind unsre *Chaucer*, *Spenser*, und *Shakespear*? Wie weit stehen unsre Meistersanger unter jenen! und wo auch diese Gold enthalten, wer hat sie gesammelt? wer mag sich um sie kümmern? Und doch sind wirklich beide Nationen in diesen Grundadern der Dichtung sich bis auf Wendungen, Reime, Lieblingssylbenmasse und Vorstellungsarten so ähnlich, wie ein jeder wissen muss, der Rittererzählungen, Balladen, Märchen beider Völker kennt.³

¹ *SWS.*, xxv, p. 8.

² *SWS.*, xxv, p. 331.

³ *SWS.*, ix, pp. 525 f. Percy's observation (1765, III, p. v) that the Scandinavian nations, being late converts to Christianity, kept their 'original manners and opinions longer than the other nations of the Gothic race: and therefore they have preserved more of the genuine compositions of their ancient poets, than their southern neighbours', turned Shakespeare, as the natural successor of the minstrels and 'bards', into a completely national, Germanic poet, and Herder would be the first to draw this inference. It should, moreover, be noted in this connexion that Herder, in the wake of Mallet, idealised the Teutonic nations as sources of strength and vitality in the Middle Ages (*SWS.*, v, pp. 613 ff.). It is clear that

The conclusion follows easily. Whereas in England the national poetic tradition, that arose in the Middle Ages, was strong enough not to be overcome by, but to assimilate, the foreign substance of the Renaissance, and therefore lived on as a fruitful basis for the work of the Elizabethan and later poets, in Germany this was not the case. Herder never tired of bemoaning the loss of Charles the Great's collection of folk-songs and condemning the Latin domination over German culture in the Middle Ages, on which he fastened the blame for all Germany's later troubles.¹ The breach thus begun was widened by the Renaissance and rendered almost irreparable by the wars of religion, so that Herder can write, with great bitterness:

Aus altern Zeiten haben wir also durchaus keine lebende Dichterei, auf der unsre neuere Dichtkunst, wie Sprosse auf dem Stamm der Nation gewachsen wäre; dahingegen andre Nationen mit den Jahrhunderten fortgegangen sind, und sich auf eigenem Grunde, aus Nationalprodukten, auf dem Glauben und Geschmack des Volks, aus Resten alter Zeiten gebildet haben. Dadurch ist ihre Dichtkunst und Sprache national worden, Stimme des Volks ist genutzt und geschätzt, sie haben in diesen Dingen weit mehr ein Publikum bekommen, als wir haben. Wir arme Deutsche sind von jeher bestimmt gewesen, nie unser zu bleiben: immer die Gesetzgeber und Diener fremder Nationen, ihre Schicksalsentscheider und ihre verkaufte, blutende, ausgesogene Sklaven.²

The only remedy Herder could see was for his countrymen to follow the example set by Percy; namely, to seek out the unknown songs of the people, so that there would be available a native foundation upon which the literature of the future might be built; to reproduce—artificially, it is true—in contemporary Germany literary conditions similar to those of the late Middle Ages and the sixteenth century in England, in order that a revival comparable to that of the Elizabethan period might be brought about. A German Shakespeare would be born only of the German folk-song.

This is the message of the *Fragmente* over again, in more precise form, and Herder's attitude remained substantially the same to the end in this, his 'Lieblingsidee'. The folk-song was his constant occupation throughout his life, and in his last years he elaborated and published to the world the practical consequences of his researches, his views on the lyrical origins of the epic. Almost simultaneously, in the *Briefe zu Beförderung der Humanität* in 1796, he wrote of Shakespeare in words that might well have belonged to any period within the preceding quarter of a century:

Er steht zwischen der alten und neuen Dichtkunst, als ein Inbegriff beider da. Die Ritter- und Feenwelt, die ganze Englsche Geschichte, und so manch andres Shakespeare thereby acquired an additional significance, his debt to Scandinavian mythology is pointed out by Herder in the *Iduna* (*SWS.*, xviii, p. 491). Cf. also the important characterization of England as 'ein Kernhalt nordischer Poesie und Sprache' (*SWS.*, ix, p. 522).

¹ Cf. *SWS.*, xxv, p. 5; i, p. 365; xviii, p. 381.

² *SWS.*, ix, p. 528.

interessantes Mahrchen lag vor ihm aufgeschlagen; er braucht, erzählt, handelt sie ab, stellt sie dar mit aller Lieblichkeit eines alten Novellen- und Fabeldichters. Seine Ritter und Helden, seine Könige und Stände treten in der ganzen Pracht ihrer und seiner Zeit vor, die in so manchen Gesinnungen, und dem ganzen Verhältnis der Stände gegen einander uns jetzt wie eine aus den Gräbern erstehende Welt vorkommt. Wie oft müssen wir über die wundersame Einfach und Befangenheit jener Zeiten lacheln! In allem ist er ein darstellender *Minstrel*,¹ der Personen, Auftritte, Zeiten giebt, wie sie sich ihm gaben, und zu seinem Zweck dienten. Nun aber wenn er in diesen Scenen der alten Welt uns die Tiefen des menschlichen Herzens eröffnet, und im wunderbarsten, jedoch durchaus charakteristischen Ausdruck eine Philosophie vortragt, die alle Stände und Verhältnisse, alle Charaktere und Situationen der Menschheit beleuchtet, so milde beleuchtet, dass allenthalben das Licht aus ihnen selbst zuruckzustrahlen scheint: da ist er nicht nur ein Dichter der neuern Zeit, sondern ein Spiegel für theatralische Dichter aller Zeiten.²

This romantic passage touches also on the other lines of approach to which Herder had directed attention at the end of the Shakespeare essay in *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst*. The second point—his study of the qualities of Shakespeare's genius—follows as a matter of course. The essay, as we know it, itself supplies considerable material; what he had intended to say in the conclusion has doubtless passed over into such works as *Über die Wirkung der Dichtkunst*. Herder's theory of genius has, however, been studied in detail³ and here it is only necessary to refer it to the place he himself assigned it within his Shakespearean criticism.

The third element in Herder's thoughts on Shakespeare—the dramatic point of view—fits in ill, if taken in the narrow sense, with what we know of his mentality. Abstractions on the structure and technique of the drama are the very last thing we should expect from him. Feeling, not aesthetic theory, was his medium. Nevertheless, this heading must be held to cover the discussion of the three unities, the references to Aristotle and to Lessing's interpretation of him, and finally—though this may also come within the scope of the previous point—the poet's workmanship, his creation of illusion, his manner of characterization and motivation and his use of scenic effects. All this finds a place in the essay as we know it and in the important second draft,⁴ and it is clear that the historical approach to dramaturgical matters was for Herder the only true one. For the rest, directly after stating his intentions, he proceeds to pour scorn on any conventional classification of Shakespearean drama,⁵ in order, no doubt, to clear the way for his much broader basis of appreciation. In view of this, it is certainly not necessary hastily to conclude that Herder's attitude to the poet was lyrical in nature, because

¹ The italics are Herder's.

² Cf. especially, H. Wolf, op. cit.

³ *SWS.*, v, p. 230.

⁴ *SWS.*, xviii, pp. 101 f.

⁵ Cf. H. Isaacsen, op. cit., pp. 30 ff.

he allotted him so important a place in the *Volkshieder*,¹ or that he considered him as a playwright to be read rather than to be seen acted.² In general, however, this third point seems to be little more than a modification or amplification of the preceding one, or perhaps rather in the nature of a bridge leading to the problem that constantly haunted Herder's mind, the fourth of those we have found it possible to isolate from the programme of the Shakespeare essay, that of history in its relation to literature.

The crisis in Herder's development took place during the journey from Riga to Nantes, when the conviction flashed into his mind and took complete possession of him that it was his destiny to study the history and character of the human race. This involved his reorientation towards literature. His method hitherto had been to explain literature out of history; without ever discarding this standpoint, he henceforth proceeds in the reverse direction as well and explains history out of literature.³ For literature can supply data which might otherwise be unattainable about humanity in past ages; it is recognized, therefore, not as an end in itself, but as a means to an end; it is the handmaid of Herder's philosophy. This new development did not, however, become at once predominant; Herder's vast historical programme had itself to pass through several phases, to be treated with more than one cleansing agent, before it emerged, with sufficient of its cloudiness removed, for it to be put to practical use. The two processes in his criticism rather continued to exist side by side, inextricably interlocked. It is doubtful indeed whether Herder himself was at all times sure which one he was following out. In the Shakespeare essay there are distinct signs that both methods were being confused with one another, doubtless to the detriment of Herder's peace of mind; it is not too much to say, indeed, that here is one reason for the non-completion of the work. He could not eat his cake and have it—explain poetry with the aid of history and, at one and the same time, use it to throw light on history. To show how Shakespeare reproduced in his work the national tradition and substance of his time, is one thing; to utilize him as a channel through which that tradition and substance might be approached, is another. For Herder there is no such distinction;

¹ G. Weber, op. cit., pp. 73 f., 165 ff.: 'das Naturhafte' and 'das Volksliedartige' are not fully synonymous, as Weber fancies; also A. Koschmieder, *Herders theoretische Stellung zum Drama*, Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, N.F., 35, Stuttgart, 1913, p. 92.

² R. Haym, op. cit., I, p. 440.

³ Cf. the important passage, *SWS.*, XVIII, p. 58. This point of view was all the more important to Herder in view of the educative, apostolic character he saw in great poets; so that they not only revealed, but helped to mould, the outlook of their age and nation. Cf. the whole essay *Über die Wirkung der Dichtkunst*, *SWS.*, VIII.

he does both at once, almost in the same breath. He seeks to penetrate into the spiritual life of the age from which Shakespeare sprang, in order to understand Shakespeare the better—that is his historical method of literary criticism at work; simultaneously, he seeks to understand Shakespeare the better, in order to comprehend the age that produced him—that is part of his gigantic ambition to embrace within his mind the whole history of humanity. To combine both these methods on every page, in every word, almost, would be a *tour de force* quite beyond Herder. He felt the difficulty and withdrew from the attempt.

It is understandable, therefore, why Herder devoted so much attention to the 'romantische Denkart' of the Middle Ages.¹ Shakespeare led him to it; Shakespeare may even be held responsible for the manner in which he idealized it and contrasted it so powerfully with the barrenness of his own age in *Auch Eine Philosophie der Geschichte*; for not only, as we have seen,² did Shakespearean drama draw him to the rich and glamorous colour of the past, the pulsing life of royalty and chivalry and the romance of the fairy world, so that his vision, as Lempicki has shown, was one derived from fiction rather than from real data; but also the fact that such an atmosphere had been able to bring forth the greatness of Elizabethan literature, drove him to the conclusion that the very possibility of real poetry coming into being in Germany was questionable, unless the laxity and corruption of the times could be overcome. The influence of cultural environment on literature had been from the beginning one of Herder's favourite themes and now he began in real earnest to strive, not merely for a literary revival, but for a thorough rejuvenation of culture generally. The change-over from literary criticism to human education was complete. It followed that something of the throbbing vitality, the piety and emotion, the 'romantische Denkart' of the Middle Ages would have to be infused into the decaying thought of his century. Here was a theme of tremendous attraction for the teacher in Herder and it came upon him at a moment when he was tortured by the isolation and ineffectiveness of his life at Bückeburg. It extended far beyond the scope of a mere essay on Shakespeare.

There were other ways in which Shakespeare threw light on history.

¹ *SWS.*, ix, p. 524. Cf. S. von Lempicki, 'Bücherwelt und wirkliche Welt', *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, iii, 1925, pp. 347 ff. In the draft of the *Ideen* Herder shows how the Norman Conquest infused a wealth of Romantic thought into England: 'Der Überwindung der Normänner also sind die Engländer ihren Shakespear, sammt ihren andern grossen Dichtern mit schuldig: denn wären sie ein abgeschlossenes Inselvolk geblieben, so wären in ihrer unbehülflichen Angelsächsischen Sprache zwar andere, aber gewiss nicht diese Dichter entstanden. Dem grössten Reichtum Romantischer Ideen haben die Normänner zu ihrem Lande den Weg gewiesen' (*SWS.*, xiv, p. 516).

² Cf. the reference at the foot of p. 275 above.

It was, in Herder's view, the nature of creative genius to be part and parcel of the very source of things, of the Godhead immanent within the universe. His function was to make known God's purpose, to interpret the nature of which he was a part, by making it live again, by reconstructing and re-enacting its modes of operation, by recreating it, as it were, before the very eyes of his fellow-men, so that they might observe and comprehend it. When Herder called Shakespeare a 'dramatischer Gott', he meant by that that he stood in the same relationship to his material as the Creator did to His, moulding it according to the same laws of creation; that he was, so to speak, a creator in miniature, producing, or rather reproducing, in his work the universe God had created, and making plain, by his special insight, its meaning and purpose. This is what Herder has in mind when he says, in a much misunderstood passage, that he loses all idea of the theatre, wings and actors, when reading Shakespeare;¹ his attention is monopolized by the revelation of the world process, the 'Blätter aus dem Buch der Begebenheiten, der Vorsehung, der Welt',² with which he is presented. He can therefore declare with justice that to him 'jedes Stück ist *History* im weitsten Verstande',³ or: 'also hat Shakespeare Geschichte, aber nicht als Geschichte aufs Theater gebracht.'⁴ When we compare what Herder has to say on the subject of genius in and after the Shakespeare essay with what he had written previously, the conclusion forces itself upon us that it must have been his reading of Shakespeare and of Shakespearean criticism that was responsible for the main lines of this thought: his 'Geniebegriff' was, indeed, rapidly developing towards a crisis in these very years.

Herder was able to write in this way about Shakespeare's genius because by it he himself had been greatly assisted in arriving at his conception of the universe. His eyes were opened, not only to the colour and action of the past, but to the inherent meaning of history as a whole. From the contemplation of Shakespearean drama as history it was for him an easy step to the opposite conception of history as a great drama, a series of scenes growing dramatically one out of the other and leading to the ultimate purpose set by God.⁵ This is, of course, not so much a philosopher's as an artist's approach; but, thanks to it, the way was now

¹ *SWS.*, v, p. 219. Cf. H. Isaacsen, op. cit., pp. 22, 33 f.

² *SWS.*, v, p. 219.

³ *SWS.*, v, p. 230.

⁴ *SWS.*, v, p. 244. Many passages could be quoted in support from the final version, and especially the second draft, of the essay. Cf. also: 'Shakespeare ist Geschichte der Menschheit in Anschauen gebracht', ix, p. 544; 'Dichter des Weltzyklus', xxiii, p. 362. Goethe's significant remarks to the same effect in his *Rede zum Shakespeare-Tag* (Weimar edition, i, xxxvii, p. 133) should also be compared.

⁵ *SWS.*, v, pp. 559, 513 and 168; cf. R. Stadelmann, op. cit., pp. 138 ff.

open for those shapeless abstractions that had long filled his mind to burst forth in some tangible and comprehensible shape. Herder learned to see, not only movement and life and continuity in history, but the interaction of motive, character and circumstance, as in some tremendous tragedy constructed by an omnipotent and omniscient Providence. Shakespeare, in this way, suggested a working plan for Herder's philosophy of history and facilitated the composition of *Auch Eine Philosophie*. That a fatalistic note was struck in this, is not unnatural. Every element, while developing and achieving perfection in its own particular way, is seen ultimately to be a link in the chain of progress, perplexing though it may be to human eyes, towards a pre-ordained goal. To set out this new vision of history something much more than an essay on Shakespeare was necessary—a work, indeed, that would have to be almost as much theological as historical.

And Herder's experience of Shakespeare supplemented and was supplemented by the Biblical studies that he pursued with ever-increasing intensity after the beginning of 1772 in company with the lonely, pining Countess Maria. The Bible taught him to see what was the true purpose, the preordained goal of this vast drama of history—the Kingdom of God. Shakespeare led the way, then, to the spiritual crisis that took place in the autumn of that year:¹ thereafter he receded, thrust aside by Herder's new, absorbing interest; for now it was all religion and the world and worldly things were left behind. Herder had outgrown the Shakespeare essay.

Shakespeare meant so much to Herder that he found it impossible to set down his thoughts in one short work. Bode's anxiety to get *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst* off his hands was no doubt excuse enough for him to leave the essay on Shakespeare a fragment and reserve his main material for other writings. He had moved rapidly away from literature to history and theology and lost no time in getting down to these more alluring fields. In August 1773, soon after his honeymoon, the manuscript of *Auch Eine Philosophie der Geschichte* was ready, and was followed in September by that of the first three parts of the *Älteste Urkunde*, in October by the *Volkslieder*, in the first form, which did not reach the public, and in November by the *Provinzialblätter*—all of them very pressing tasks. The road to Shakespeare was the road to new and entrancing panoramas; his surveying trip led on to the exploration of a vast, uncharted hinterland.

¹ M. Doerne, *Die Religion in Herders Geschichtsphilosophie*, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 75 ff.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

'SCŪRHEARD'

The adjective *scūrheard* occurs twice in O.E. verse—in *Beowulf* (l. 1033) and in *Andreas* (l. 1133), in each case used of a sword. In *Judith* (l. 79) occurs the expression *scūrum heard* also used of a sword. Bosworth-Toller translates by 'made hard by blows', but there seems to be no other authority for interpreting *scūr* as a 'shower of blows'. Might it not be possible that the author of *Beowulf* was misled by the word *regnheard* which occurs in line 326? The intensive prefix *regn-* (cf. Go. *ragin*) occurs in O.E. in such compounds as *regnmeld*, *regnþeof*, etc. but it does not appear elsewhere in the poem. The form *regn* would probably be much more familiar to the poet in such compounds as *regn-scūr*, *regn-dropa*, etc. meaning *rain* and of course of entirely different origin (though actually *regn* in this sense does not occur, either as a simple or a compound, in the poem). As a variation on *regnheard* the poet invents *scūrheard* and the *Andreas* poet borrows the word from him. The form *scūrum heard* in *Judith* would then be merely an extension based perhaps on the form in *Andreas* or *Beowulf* or in some other poem where the expression occurred. Such an extension may be paralleled by *nīþheard* (*Beowulf*, l. 2417) compared with *nīþa heardum* (*Beowulf*, l. 2170).

B. COLGRAVE.

DURHAM.

SOME NOTES ON RIDDLE 21

The Old English Riddle from the Exeter Book, usually numbered 21 (22 in Tupper), seems to describe a plough of the heavy type such as is represented in the Anglo-Saxon Calendar in the British Museum. (Cott. Tib. B. v. See Hoops *Reallexikon*, s.v. 'Ackerbau' for reproduction.) This plough is obviously the same type as that which Vergil describes in the *Georgics* I, ll. 169–75. According to Vergil, it consisted of the plough-body (*buris*) from whose base extends the beam (*temo*); fastened to the plough-body are two mould-boards and slades. The stilt (*stiva*) attached to the plough-body moves the fore-carriage (*currus*) (cf. *Antiquity*, VI, No. 23, pp. 327 ff.)¹.

When we turn to the picture in Cott. Tib. B. v., it is clear that the type of plough depicted there is the same. There is a long beam which

¹ For a further account of the heavy plough see R. G. Collingwood and J. N. L. Myres, *Roman Britain and the English Settlements* (Oxford, 1936), pp. 211 ff. and 442.

seems to pass through the plough-body just below the handles. The plough-body joins on to the mould-boards to which is attached the ploughshare. Through the beam there runs a wooden pole which serves to fasten the beam to the plough-body and share. In front of this and also through the beam runs the coulter, and the beam is attached to the fore-carriage, though exactly in what way is not clear in the picture.

Riddle 21 seems to concern itself chiefly with the plough proper apart from the fore-carriage. 'My nose (i.e. the ploughshare) is pointed downwards. I go face downwards (nēol).' The nose is on the ground and so the whole main body of the plough roughly resembles a person crawling along the ground. The same figure is preserved in the references to the back and the head in lines 10 and 11. 'I go as the grey enemy of the wood (hār holtes fēond) and my lord guides (wīsað) me.' The phrase 'the grey enemy of the wood' has been variously interpreted as a kenning for the ox, the iron of the plough, and the ploughman. But 'hār holtes fēond' is obviously the subject of 'wīsað' which is singular, and it is natural to speak of the ploughman as guiding the plough. It would seem therefore best to take the phrase as a kenning for ploughman, and it is particularly appropriate, seeing that most of the plough is made of wood which is brought from the forest (brungen of bearwe, l. 7). It may be no more than a coincidence that the man driving the plough in Cott. Tib. B. v. is bearded, unlike the rest of the figures, and so appears to be older than the others. The lord 'walks stooping (wōh færeð)' just as the man does who is driving the plough in the picture. He 'lifts me and presses me on (wegeð mec ond pyð)'. This phrase occurs again in some obscure lines in Riddle 12. If 'wegeð' has any special meaning and is not merely a tag, it may imply that the ploughman lifts the handles of the plough slightly in order to get the share to the correct angle for cutting. '(I am) borne on a fore-carriage (wegen on wægne).' 'Wægn' here evidently refers to the fore-carriage which Vergil calls the 'currus'. The usual translation 'carried on a wagon' seems to have little meaning. 'As I go along there is green on one side of me and my track is clear and black on the other.' It is obvious from this that the soil was actually turned over and not merely scratched up. 'Driven through my back there hangs beneath me a well-wrought sharp weapon (pīl).' This is the wood which fastens the plough-body to the mould-boards and ploughshare. The back is of course the beam of the plough. 'Another (hangs) at my head firmly fixed and pointing forward (forðweard).' This is the coulter which can be seen clearly pointing forward in the picture. 'What I tear with my teeth falls to one side (fealleþ on sidan) if he who is my lord serves me well from

behind.' I place a stop after 'forðweard', thus making 'pæt ic toþum tere', rather than 'ðper', the subject of 'fealleþ'. This gives a far clearer sense than if we take the passage to mean that it is the coulter which 'leans to one side', as is usually done. It will be seen that if the riddle is interpreted in the way I have suggested above, it provides a detailed and elaborate description of the heavy type of plough.

B. COLGRAVE.

DURHAM.

THE 'SECOND NUN'S TALE', A MEDIAEVAL SERMON

The *Second Nun's Tale* of Chaucer is, both in form and content, an almost perfect example of the *de sanctis* type of sermon. These sermons were preached on the day of the saint concerned, and usually took the form of panegyrics. The most popular source for the material seems to have been the *Legenda Aurea*, which is supposed to have furnished Chaucer with his material. Ordinarily, the Saint Cecilia sermon would have been preached on or about the twenty-second of November.

As to form, the *Second Nun's Tale* conforms to the type as follows:

(1) *Theme*. As is usual with the *de sanctis* sermon, this takes the form of a simple statement of the saint's name (l. 28).

(2) *Invocation*. This is most elaborate (ll. 29-84), is addressed to the Virgin, and includes the troublesome apology,

... though that I, unworthy sone of Eve,
Be synful... (ll. 62-3)

(3) *Definition*. This is the common practice in this type, and is worked out in some detail by Chaucer (ll. 85-119).

(4) *The body of the sermon*. As was customary, this is composed of a long story about the saint (ll. 120-553), ending with a statement of the location of the relics. This forms an interesting parallel with the 'advertising' theory of the French epic.

The closing benediction and prayer, however, are absent. This is surprising when we consider the number of secular tales where they appear. But it might be going too far to suggest that something has been lost.

CLAUDE JONES.

BALTIMORE, MD.

A LETTER OF NOVALIS

In my recent article on Friedrich Schlegel's religion (*M.L.R.*, xxxi, No. 4, pp. 539 ff.) I concluded by suggesting that the political philosophy of the German Romantics was a function of their self-consciousness and

hence their self-defence as poets. An interesting though indirect confirmation of this view is to be found in a letter of Novalis which he wrote to his father from Leipzig, announcing his wish to become a soldier (9. ii. 1793, No. 25, p. 34 in Samuel's edition; vol. iv of the Kluckhohn edition of the *Schriften*). Reading the letter one is impressed by the difficulty the young poet was feeling in ordering his life according to the precepts of his puritanical father. He feels that only through adherence to those precepts can he become a good citizen. In the disciplined life of the soldier he says he will find the means of properly ordering his life; discipline will aid him in subordinating his rebellious spirit to duty. But these seem rather negative reasons, dictated rather by what he knew of the man to whom he was writing. Just in one or two odd phrases we see what really attracted him fundamentally in the soldier's rather than in any other profession. In it, he says, 'ein Geist führt zu einem grossen Ziele' and that life 'immer nur als Medium erscheint' (p. 38) for life 'darf immer nur Mittel und fast nie Zweck sein' (p. 40). He feels convinced that to become a soldier is his 'Bestimmung' (p. 39), and that it is an 'innere Stimme' that drives him to this decision (p. 41).

The young Novalis feels, therefore, that he must follow a calling that will coincide with his inner call. The Romantic feels that the man and his activity should be organically one. Further he wishes that this activity should be the visible expression of a wider idea. That he chooses the activity of the soldier shows that this wider idea is, for him, the idea of which the community to which he belongs, the state, is the expression. It is clear how much of Novalis' later political theory is already present here. The 'sacramental' political theory of Adam Müller, who owed so much to the influence of Novalis, is also here in germ. It should at least be clear from this letter how for Novalis the demand for an 'organic' ordering of society was intimately bound up with his own personal difficulty in feeling one with the society in which he lived. According to the Romantic theory of the state each individual would feel himself as much at one with the community as a unit, through his own particular activity, as the soldier does through his.

The idea of the soldier-poet in modern times, so different from the Volker ideal, is altogether worth more consideration. Vigny and Psichari suggest interesting possibilities.

J. WELTMAN.

SALFORD.

EDITORIAL NOTE

PROPOSED ANGLO-NORMAN TEXT SOCIETY

The Editor is sure that readers of the *Modern Language Review* will be interested in the following proposals made with the object of founding an Anglo-Norman Text Society, the activities of which would be a valuable supplement to those of this journal, in the field of mediaeval scholarship.

At a joint meeting of the Philological Society of London and the Manchester Philological Club, held at Manchester on 17 October 1936, an interim committee was formed, representative of literary, linguistic and historical interests, to consider the organization of a society to promote the study of the Anglo-Norman language and literature. This committee has now decided to issue the following statement for the consideration of scholars in any way interested in this field of study.

(1) It is desirable to found a society for the study of the Anglo-Norman language and literature, which shall concern itself with the publication of the results of such study and particularly with the publication of texts, its title to be The Anglo-Norman Text Society.

(2) The reasons for the foundation of such a society are (a) the great historical, legal, literary and linguistic importance of Anglo-Norman during several centuries of English history; (b) the large number of texts, documents and other material still unprinted; (c) the necessity for new and more correct editions of a number of those already published; (d) the need for closer study of various stages in the history of the French language in England, both in itself and in its connexion with the development of English; and (e) the lack of co-operation at present existing between historians, lawyers and philologists, all of whom are interested in the study of Anglo-Norman.

(3) It is anticipated that the annual subscription to be paid by members of the proposed society will be fixed at £1, or five dollars. When the committee has ascertained the amount of support likely to be forthcoming in the form of subscriptions, it will approach learned bodies and existing societies (such as the Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature) for further support or collaboration. It is hoped in this way to ensure regular publication of a series of texts to be issued to all members of the society.

Those interested should communicate with Professor M. K. Pope, The University, Manchester, 13, the Honorary Secretary of the Committee, of which Sir William Craigie is Chairman.

C. J. Sisson,
General Editor.

REVIEWS

The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs. Compiled by W. G. SMITH. With Introduction and Index by JANET E. HESELTINE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. xxvii + 644 pp. 21s.

Comme l'indique le titre, cet important ouvrage se compose de deux parties très différentes: une introduction assez ample où Mrs J. Heseltine résume, en un aperçu rapide et instructif, la bibliographie des proverbes dans la littérature anglaise, et d'autre part une compilation compacte où figurent, à côté de proverbes proprement dits, de simples expressions, littéraires ou familières, des maximes morales ou épigrammatiques, des dictons d'origine anglaise ou écossaise.

Aujourd'hui, l'étude des proverbes se présente sous trois aspects. Tantôt l'auteur s'efforce de rassembler, comme l'a fait ici M. Smith, tous les matériaux qui se distinguent par un air plus ou moins proverbial—ou bien il s'attache à classer les exemples rencontrés dans un auteur ou à une époque déterminée, comme l'ont fait M. Tilley pour Lyly, M. Whiting pour Chaucer, d'autres pour l'*Ancoren Riwle* ou les romans du moyen âge. Ailleurs, chez M. Taylor entre autres (en 1931), on étudie l'origine et la structure du proverbe, considéré du point de vue de la stylistique.

Il est naturel que le travail de M. Smith doive beaucoup à ses prédécesseurs, depuis le John Ray des *English Proverbs* (1760) jusqu'à W. C. Hazlitt en 1869 et Apperson en 1929, sans oublier l'*Oxford Dictionary* dont la méthode historique s'est imposée aux recueils d'Apperson et de Smith. Mais il y a entre ces derniers une différence essentielle: le classement d'Apperson s'inspire de la nature du sujet auquel se rapporte chacun des 'proverbes'; celui de Smith est beaucoup plus simpliste: il range ses matériaux par ordre alphabétique d'après la lettre initiale la plus courante de chaque proverbe enregistré. Supposons que nous désirions trouver dans ce *Dictionnaire* le curieux dicton élizabéthain: *Such lips, such lettuce*, nous devons le chercher non pas à 'Such', mais à 'Like', parce qu'à côté de '*Such lips...*', il existe une variante '*Like lips, like lettuce*' préférée par Ray. Reconnaissons d'ailleurs qu'un Index, élaboré avec un soin remarquable, donne, par ordre alphabétique, les mots-clefs de chaque proverbe et permet, sans trop de peine, de se retrouver dans ce maquis. Heureux cependant les chercheurs qui n'ont affaire ni à *devil* (97 références), ni à *dog* (une centaine), ni à *fool* (au moins 80), ni à beaucoup d'autres renvois!

Aussi ce 'Dictionnaire' n'est-il, et sans doute n'a-t-il voulu être, qu'une collection de matériaux. Pour étudier les véritables 'proverbes' qu'il contient, il faudrait élaguer, d'abord les expressions littéraires ou populaires (*London lickpenney*, *Loaves and fishes*, *Lob's pound*, etc.), ensuite les maximes forgées par des écrivains et qui, aujourd'hui encore, ont gardé leur caractère littéraire de citations (le *Reading maketh a full*

man, ou le *Riches are but the baggage of virtue*, de Bacon), pour ne conserver que celles qui ont été vraiment adoptées par la 'sagesse des nations', et dont le signe distinctif le plus fréquent semble bien être une sorte de balancement euphuistique, souligné, si possible, par une assonance initiale ou finale (*When the ale is in, the wit is out;—Like will to like;—Birds of a feather flock together*).

R. HUCHON.

PARIS.

The Allegory of Love. A study in medieval tradition. By C. S. LEWIS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1936. x+378 pp. 15s.

This is undoubtedly one of the best books on mediaeval literature ever published in this country, and every page reveals in the author an unusual degree of scholarship and critical insight. The scope of the book is wider than might be inferred from the title or from the author's expressed intention: 'I am trying to tell the history not only of the form, allegory, but also of the sentiment, courtly love.' This double aim is achieved, but the book contains a good deal that is not very closely connected with either of these subjects, and might be regarded as a collection of essays on mediaeval literature linked together by some similarity of theme. Few readers will complain of this willingness to digress, since to it we owe much admirable criticism and many entertaining asides, such as the analysis of the character of Chaucer's Criseyde and the description of the modern equivalent of Pandarus. The book goes far to satisfy many long-felt wants. It contains a good deal of sound and penetrating criticism of much-discussed authors like Chaucer and Spenser; it treats of the lesser-known allegorical works of the fifteenth century in an interesting way which will gain them many new readers; and it contains what are probably the sanest and most illuminating expositions that have yet appeared of the difficult questions of the origin of courtly love and the nature of allegory. There is, too, a good justification of the use of allegory as a literary form: 'Good allegory (next to the style of Johnson) is the best way of reviving to our imaginations the grim or delightful truths which platitude conceals' (p. 288). The author is fully aware of the importance of his subject, and makes claims for it which some readers will probably think extravagant. Thus he thinks the influence of courtly love on English life and literature to be so great that compared with it the Renaissance is 'a mere ripple on the surface of literature'. But in discussing individual authors he is more moderate, and he resists the temptation to exaggerate the mediaevalism of Spenser. With characteristic generosity, before criticizing *The Faerie Queene*, the author leaves his main theme in order to give an account of the Italian epic to which Spenser owed so much. We are warned of the danger of thinking of Spenser too exclusively as 'the poet's poet', and similar warnings against popular misconceptions are given fairly frequently in other parts of the book. Some of these are very necessary, as for example the warning against assuming that the author of an allegory is 'really'

talking about the thing symbolized and not at all about the thing that symbolizes, or the reminder that our lungs are apt to be too 'tickle o' the sere' in reading Chaucer; but occasionally one feels that the caution is a little unnecessary, as for example when we are warned not to identify Chaucer's Criseyde with Bialacoil.

It is clear that the author's sympathetic understanding of mediaeval literature does not prevent him from appreciating later works, and the book contains many illuminating asides on modern literature. The author's familiarity with many different periods of literature and his sensitiveness to subtle differences of style make him an extremely skilful translator, and translations of illustrative passages are given, sometimes in addition to the passages themselves and sometimes in place of them. It is not often that a translator has such a wide range in choosing a suitable medium; some passages are turned into Middle English verse, some into Modern English blank verse, and one into prose with 'a faintly sixteenth-century flavour'. In conclusion, some points of detail may be mentioned. A few misprints or eccentricities of spelling have remained uncorrected, e.g. *mazochism* (p. 186, etc.), *skeptophilia* (p. 332), *The Fairie Queene* (p. 297), *Ancoren Rwele* (p. 364). The name of Chaucer's heroine appears as Cryseide beside Cresseide, although the form Criseyde seems to have most support from modern usage, and rests on good manuscript authority. The author's love of parenthesis is probably to be blamed for an ungrammatical sentence at the foot of p. 257.

G. L. BROOK.

MANCHESTER.

Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters Palace of Pleasure. By JOSEF RAITH. Leipzig: Universitätsverlag von Robert Noske. 1936. 167 pp. 5 M.

The author begins by surveying the indebtedness of Chaucer to Boccaccio, and incidentally shows how the stories of Troilus and Cressida, Palamon and Arcite, and Grisild were developed by later English writers. As English and Italian scholars have sometimes charged one another with national bias in discussing the relationship of the *Canterbury Tales* to the *Decameron*, it is interesting to see what is the view of a German researcher. Like W. F. Schirmer, but unlike Löhmann, Dr Raith concludes that all Chaucer owed to the *Decameron* was the story of Grisild, which reached him through the Latin of Petrarch and through a French translation. After considering Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, Dr Raith touches on the two versions derived from *De claris mulieribus*, the one anonymous, the other by Lord Morley. He then discusses very ably various translations of the stories of Guiscardo and Ghismonda and Titus and Gisippus by Gilbert Banister, William Walter, Edward Lewicke, Sir Thomas Elyot, and an anonymous poet of the fifteenth century. The author here makes valuable additions to the conclusions reached by Zupitza and in particular one may note that he establishes the familiarity of Banister with Chaucer's *Booke of the Duchesse*. Finally, an account is given of the two sixteenth-

century translations of the tales of Cymon and Iphigenia and Nastagio and Traversari.

In this main section of the book a few points call for comment: (i) The quotations from the preface to Morley's translation and from the early versions of the tales of Guiscardo and Ghismonda and Titus and Gisippus do not always reproduce the original books and manuscripts correctly; (ii) Lord Morley's translation of *De claris mulieribus* is not complete. It contains only 46 out of 105 lives; (iii) on p. 74, by a slip of the pen, Henry Parker, Lord Morley, is referred to as John Morley, and again on pp. 123 and 134; (iv) on p. 80 (a) the reference should be to Patent Rolls, 18 Edward IV, part 2, m. 15; (v) a catalogue of the library at Chatsworth does exist. It was published in London in 1879; and (vi) in any bibliography of Chaucer-Boccaccio literature, however condensed, the name of Professor Mario Praz ought certainly to appear.

The two chapters which follow the main section of Dr Raith's book go somewhat beyond the limits which its title would suggest. He gives a concise survey of the Italian tale in England up to 1620 and by way of conclusion offers a sketch of Boccaccio in eighteenth and nineteenth-century English literature. This sketch is incomplete, for Dr Raith has of set purpose excluded the drama, and, apart from this, there are important omissions. However, this is hardly surprising in view of the vastness of the field under consideration. Rather one may express admiration at the wide knowledge displayed, embracing as it does such out of the way poems as Thomas Russell's sonnet on Boccaccio. With true scholarly zeal and great resourcefulness Dr Raith has contended with the limitations imposed by the inaccessibility of much of the material in question and even though he has not altogether overcome this handicap, his book does suggest how extensive the influence of Boccaccio in England has been and how closely that influence is connected with general cultural tendencies.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

The Complaint of Henry Duke of Buckingham. Including the *Induction*, or, Thomas Sackville's Contribution to the *Mirror for Magistrates*. Edited from the Author's MS. by MARGUERITE HEARSEY. (*Yale Studies in English*, 86.) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xii + 139 pp. 9s.

In 1929 Dr Hearsey came upon this MS. (St John's College, Cambridge, 364) and with the assistance of Mr Robin Flower was able to show that it was written partly, if not wholly, in Sackville's own hand. Holograph MSS. of works of literary importance from the Tudor period are sufficiently rare for this to be a discovery of great importance. The object of this edition is to present the MS. text untampered with in a setting of Introduction (literary, textual and biographical), Commentary and collation with the first printed edition. In view of the debatable relation between Elizabethan MS. and printed book Miss Hearsey is to be con-

gratulated on her decision to refrain from editorial handling of the text, even from punctuation.¹

The most important section of the Introduction is the third, 'The Manuscript', though its points might have been more cogently made. It would have been businesslike to include early in the argument a clear statement of what autograph MSS. by Sackville² were used for comparison and their nature and date—also, if possible, a facsimile. Dr Hearsey refrains too heroically from speculation as to the circumstances which account for hands A and B³ in the MS., whether they point to two men at work on the writing of it or to adolescent variation and experiment by Sackville himself. While fully aware of the value of having an author's own MS. to look at, the editor, in her anxiety not to claim too much for her find, does not develop as far as she might the interest of some features of the MS., for example, some of the author's corrections, the jottings after stanza 188, and the last entries of all on pp. 90–1.

In the Commentary details of subject-matter and expression are discussed and much useful illustrative material is collected from Virgil, Lydgate and early-Tudor authors. This section suffers in scholarly effect from having been compiled to meet the needs of two types of reader—the one who is interested in parallels and sources and prepared to read them in Latin and the one who requires explanation of ordinary mid-Tudor words and forms and the poetic archaisms then in common use. Often the glosses are accompanied by comment and so contribute towards an evaluation of Sackville's English—Dr Hearsey keeps a dutiful eye on the *N.E.D.*—but sometimes they are for the instructed superfluous, for the uninstructed, misleading.⁴

There has been no edition of the whole of Sackville's contribution to the *Mirror for Magistrates* since 1859. The printing and reprinting of his purple (or rather, sable) patches has led to a conventionalizing of the estimate of these pieces as 'containing the best poetry written in the English language between Chaucer and Spenser'. Dr Hearsey's text and illustrative material should stimulate a preciser and more discriminating evaluation. It is no discredit to Sackville, who was eighteen when the gloomy project of the *Mirror* was first mooted and who may have been writing his *Complaint* when he was twenty or little more, that many stanzas should reveal themselves as mosaics and that he should help himself out by repetitions not only of phrases and clichés (e.g. *as still as any stoon*) but also of subject-matter, but it is a fact and significant. In spite of the genuinely plangent accent of some of the finest stanzas and lines it is impossible not to smile at the thoroughness with which this well-endowed and fortunately placed young scion of a Tudor governing family set himself to outdo his collaborators in gloom. It would be

¹ Contractions are expanded in italics (spoken of as 'letters underlined', p. 9).

² On p. 16 there is a reference to letters, the earliest dated 1568, i.e. possibly ten years after the composition of the *Complaint*.

³ A MS. note in the Catalogue of MSS. in St John's College Library records Mr Flower's finding of four variations in the handwriting, all in his opinion Sackville's autograph. A and B denote the two principal variants, in general appearance strikingly dissimilar.

⁴ E.g. the gloss on st. 8, l. 2 *lustie*: beautiful.

amusing and not uninteresting to compile for *Induction* and *Complaint* an *Index Lacrimarum* like that which Henry Morley worked out for the *Man of Feeling*. If, in addition to tears, one were allowed to include sighs, shrieks, plaints, groans and their verbs, adjectives and synonyms, there would be very few stanzas without their stigmata of deadly dole. The additional stanzas, however, and the odd jottings with which the MS. peters out make it easier than it has been hitherto to get at Sackville himself and see him at work. They give proof of some clarity of critical outlook and they contain a hint of conditions or complexion which made tears a natural medium in which to dip his pen.

The task of transcription and proof-correction seems in general to have been faithfully dealt with. Some errors and doubtful points may be noted: in the Introduction (pp. 2-3) there is a curious repeated misprint 'Melpomememe'; in the textual note to st. 130, l. 3, the last word crossed out should be *hest* not *brest*; in the additional stanzas, l. 25, I do not see why *although* is omitted (although crossed out in the text it has been re-inserted in the margin), and in l. 68 the MS. has clearly a full stop after *Helicon*.

Dr Hearsey's editing lacks a little legitimate showmanship. She might have made more of her discovery, but this does not seriously detract from the service rendered to students of mid-Tudor literature by her edition and her new material.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

Directions for Speech and Style. By JOHN HOSKINS. Edited by HOYT H. HUDSON. (*Princeton Studies in English*, 12). Princeton: University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. xl+122 pp. 11s. 6d.

This lively and lucid Elizabethan rhetorical study remained, as a whole and independent work, almost unknown in MS.¹ until the appearance of this workmanlike and attractive edition. In the seventeenth century it was exploited² but neither published nor even acknowledged by the exploiters. Other fruits of Hoskins' active and trenchant mind are either lost, partially buried in MS. commonplace books, scattered in printed collections, attributed to other men, still *in situ* as inscriptions, or recorded by Aubrey. In these *disiecta membra* more personality survives than animates the folios and octavos of many solid writers whom no literary historian dares omit.

Hoskins combined an Elizabethan aplomb and versatility with the cooler critical temper and cleaner-cutting penetration of the Jacobean mind. Dismissed from the University for misdirected buffoonery he

¹ In par. 1 of the Preface Professor Hoyt refers to the notices of the MS. by Professor Malcolm Wallace and Miss L. B. Osborn. It seems strange that, though he mentions a suggestion made by Miss Mona Wilson in his Notes (p. 70), he omits here any reference to her précis of Hoskins' treatise appended to her *Life of Sidney*, 1932.

² A substantial portion was 'lifted' by Jonson for his *Timber*, Thomas Blount silently incorporated it almost *in toto* in his *Academy of Eloquence*, 1654, and from Blount many passages were 'conveyed' by John Smith to his *Mysterie of Rhetorique Unveil'd*, 1657 (see Preface and, for fuller discussions, pp. xxvii *et seq.*).

turned schoolmaster; in the early years of the seventeenth century he became a Templar, and rose to be Serjeant-at-Law in 1623. He was also a Member of Parliament and a stockholder of the Virginia Company. He shared for a time Raleigh's imprisonment and fought a duel with Sir Benjamin Rudyerd. He drank with Ben Jonson and was a friend or acquaintance of Wotton, Donne, Selden, Daniel and other wits, poets and men of affairs. He was always ready with an epigram, a piece of nonsense verse or a mock oration, but he also wrote a treatise *Of Charity and Resignation* (lost) and compiled a Greek lexicon as far as the letter *Mu*. His career and parts clearly interested Aubrey, who was able to tap for information son and grandson, in whose times MS. works by Hoskins were still circulating—in fact being borrowed and never returned. Aubrey's *Brief Life* supplies the bulk of what is known about him as a man and forms the basis of the biographical part of Professor Hoyt's Introduction.

The *Directions* is the work of his earliest phase; it is addressed to an unnamed young friend and pupil and springs from his educational interests and experiences. Internal evidence dates it pretty securely in 1598/9. Hoskins had not yet married his rich widow or burgeoned into the Templar, M.P., and country gentleman. It inclines one to think well of him as a schoolmaster. It has surety of exposition with no hint of pedantry. In Sections II and III of the Introduction Professor Hoyt discusses the aims, quality and sources of the *Directions* with sufficient detail to enable the reader to place Hoskins in the rhetorical tradition and to appreciate the significance of his principal modifications of earlier Renaissance tendency, e.g. his repointing of the figures from ornament to function. The treatise itself is full of meat both for the less and more instructed. There are numerous references to contemporaries, of which those to Lyly are not the least interesting. Euphuism belongs already to 'those days', but Lyly himself is thought of as a still active writer, 'breaking well' from his old style, from whom evidently something new may yet be expected.¹

The *Directions* is also full of allusions to fashions in speech and writing, some of which immediately place themselves, while others, such as the interesting reference (p. 39) to the mathematical phase of Elizabethan style when 'all our similitudes came from lines, circles and angles', are worth a little more following up. But perhaps to some the *Directions* will be most interesting as an expression of Hoskins' own intelligence and preferences in style. Like Puttenham, he writes of rhetoric most un-*rhetorically*. He uses, already in 1599, a seventeenth-century prose of the 'new' type sometimes for short passages amazingly modern. The Arcadian examples make a piquant contrast with their setting and would, indeed, wear a very old-fashioned air if they had not been selected with

¹ In his comment on this passage Professor Hoyt shows himself puzzled by this note of expectation and uncertain what work Hoskins could have had in mind as showing the 'break'. But in 1599 Lyly's practical cessation as a working dramatist was masked by the continued appearance of his plays in Quartos, and it seems to me that *The Woman in the Moon* fits the case admirably, especially as its Preface indicates that Lyly only required encouragement to continue this new vein.

tact and kept studiously short. The use of the *Arcadia* as a principal source by a man like Hoskins, who could never claim *Et ego in Arcadia vivam*, may at first appear strange—perhaps a concession to laziness or fashion—and might indicate that, for him as for others, the delayed appearance of the book and the still potent magic of Sidney's name masked the extent to which the tastes of the late Elizabethan world were changing. Further thought and reading show that Hoskins knew always very well where he stood. Besides the mid-Elizabethan formal overloading, the *Arcadia* possessed the substance of romance—and romance of a type that was not to lose its hold for many years. It was in all young people's hands. It is assumed that it will be in Hoskins' young pupil's hand when he reads the *Directions*; quotations and allusions are supplied with page references to the 'first edition in quarto without Sanford's additions'. And though Hoskins on behalf of youth uses his Arcadian rhetoric with good faith, hints of irony or humour show that he was not taking it *au grand sérieux*.

Professor Hoyt has modernized Hoskins' spelling and punctuated on modern lines and this may perhaps rouse criticism. It is to be remembered, however, that his approach to his text is that of a Professor of Rhetoric, not of English literature. To him Hoskins' book is not a document or a curiosity but an example of a still living and practical art. His decision may be well adapted to serve the needs of his own subject. In any case his efficient Introduction and generally full and useful notes should ensure that not only students of the phases of Elizabethan style but all who are fascinated by Elizabethan turning-points (especially the contracting of the Elizabethan world into the Jacobean) will not be able to overlook the *Directions for Speech and Style*.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

La Gerusalemme Liberata nella Inghilterra di Spenser. By ALBERTO CASTELLI. Milan: Società Editrice 'Vita e Pensiero'. 1936. xii + 130 pp. 10 lire.

Signor Castelli, aware that research into sources and influences is nowadays somewhat under a cloud, has fortified himself with the fact that imitation was an important and fruitful Renaissance principle and the belief that the study of influences leads to a critical understanding of spiritual correspondences. The chapters on Spenser and Fairfax, where the material was adequate for a full analysis, are accordingly the most interesting parts of this book, although the critical examination is not very subtle or deep-rooted; elsewhere Signor Castelli is obliged to fall back upon a competent recording of reminiscences and references, upon which the only conclusions possible are that Tasso was regarded as the greatest contemporary Italian poet, much interest was taken in his 'fury', his *Gerusalemme* was useful to those who like Sidney wanted a modern name to accompany those of ancient epic heroes, and that poets and critics alike usually saw that poem through the colour of *The Faerie Queene*. A good deal of detail, but I think nothing important, is added to

Sir Sidney Lee's concise essay on *Tasso in Shakespeare's England*. Signor Castelli limits his field to the period in which Spenser was still a dominating influence. The *Gerusalemme*, it is well known, was much in Spenser's mind in the early books of *The Faerie Queene*, Canto XII of Book II being virtually a translation. The tension in the minds of these two poets represented by the Armida-Acrasia episodes is of the deepest interest, and goes to the heart of both of them. It is clear that Spenser was drawn to Tasso by more than the glowing and romantic elements which chiefly he imitated, while the fact that it *was* those he imitated points to a different resolution of the tension—or perhaps to a failure to resolve it at all. Subsequently Ariosto counts for more in the poem. The next chapter has brief sections on Daniel, Drayton, the Fletchers, and William Browne. Richard Carew's partial translation and Fairfax's great poem are carefully examined, and the Spenserian quality of the latter demonstrated (though the examples on pp. 93-5 surely show also affiliations with a later school?). According to Dryden, Waller said he derived 'the harmony of his numbers' from Fairfax—a remark that might have been mentioned in the later section on versification. The final chapter, on criticism, gathers up a number of scattered references, in which Tasso is highly praised but nothing of consequence is said. I think a finer net would add to this list, but to nobody's profit.

Note 4, p. 12 is wrong—*Tasso's Melancholy* was new in 1594. On pp. 10-11 Abraham Fraunce's translation of the *Aminta*, 1591, seems to be confused with his translation of Watson's eclogues *Amyntas*, 1585. *Sir John Oldcastle* is called Shakespeare's on p. 110. Cadmen, p. 108, must be Camden—is Borlowe Marlowe? (Note 2 has dropped out.) Singer's edition of Fairfax was 1817, not 1871 (p. 103). Mention might have been made of the anonymous *Godfrey of Bulloigne* and Heywood's *Four Prentices*; of Shakespeare's possible recollection of Fairfax in *Cymbeline*, and Webster's of Tasso's life in *The Duchess of Malfi*; of Kyd's translation from Tasso in 1588 and Tofte's in 1599.

It will be noticed that Signor Castelli has stopped short of a promising field in poetry and criticism. Tasso-Spenser-Milton might have been the subject of an interesting study both of poetic personalities and of changes in critical fashion. But the present treatise is a useful survey of the ground chosen.

ROSS D. WALLER.

MANCHESTER.

Death and Elizabethan Tragedy. By THEODORE SPENCER. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. xii + 288 pp. 10s. 6d.

Mr Spencer's theme is, briefly, the mingling of medieval and renaissance conceptions of death in the sixteenth century, and their adaptation to the requirements of Elizabethan drama. Mr Spencer writes lucidly but he has not cast his net wide enough, and his treatment is a little remote. Thus he describes the changes in attitude towards death as if they were

logical developments of a rational philosophy unaware of, and uninfluenced by, the impact of external events. His account of the medieval conventional views on death is based largely on the authority of religious works, but his statement (p. 35) that the emphasis on 'death and the skeleton' was so heavy perhaps because 'opposing interests were so strong' was worth further investigation. The writing—and preservation—of literature in the Middle Ages was mostly in ecclesiastical hands and assuredly prejudiced in its views on death. Mr Spencer is evidently unappreciative of the terrible extent of the grim ravages of the Black Death, otherwise he would not be in doubt about the source of fourteenth-century charnel-house realism. Indeed, the late medieval emphasis on decay and putrefaction rather than on blood might have given him the clue.

The pronouncement on the relation of convention and imagination in poetry (p. 106) seems to me misleading, but perhaps 'convention' is to be interpreted as synonymous with 'universality'.

Throughout the book no distinction is made between poetry and dramatic poetry. Within the limits of his art a poet is free; a dramatist is additionally bound by the limitations of his audience, and, incidentally, by the views of the censor. In Elizabethan drama references to religion, either direct or implied, were ruthlessly expunged (*vide* Albright, *Dramatic Publication in England, 1580-1640*), and it does not seem that a dramatist was unfettered in speaking of death and the life to come, even though he used his characters as scapegoats. These restrictions applied to stage matters as well. Thus in the very interesting analysis of the use of funeral processions (pp. 183-5) an inquiry into the nature and type of those ceremonies on the stage might have been illuminating.

Mr Spencer does not claim to treat his subject exhaustively, but he omits numerous matters which are surely deserving of notice. He does not mention whether the Protestant rejection of the Catholic purgatory, or the translations of the Bible, or the institution of the Prayer Book, had any effect on popular views on death. Other things worthy of at least a passing mention are: witchcraft and death, legal and dramatic aspects of homicide in revenge plays, martyrdom (or lack of it), the duello, the jests and prophecies of dying men, and a whole host of vulgar beliefs.

The note on the 'Zoacum' speech (pp. 118-19) in *Tamburlaine* would have benefited by use of Miss Seaton's article on Marlowe's sources in the *R.E.S.* vol. v, No. 20, pp. 385-401.

Macbeth is misquoted on p. 211.

It would be ungrateful not to recognize the real merits of the study. Mr Spencer's main interest is in general tendencies, and these he states with clarity and documents with choice discrimination. His genial perspicuous style too is a delight. As an assembling of facts and deducing of general inferences without any very profound treatment this study is worthy of commendation.

J. H. WALTER.

LONDON.

Thomas Lodge. By E. A. TENNEY. (*Cornell Studies in English*. XXVI.) Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1935. ix+202 pp. 9s.

Inasmuch as he has gathered together all the factual material recently discovered by such scholars as Miss Alice Walker, Professor C. J. Sisson and Professor N. B. Paradise, and has knit it together in a consecutive and interesting manner, Mr Tenney's biographical study of Thomas Lodge is a serviceable book. He has followed his authorities with care, added one or two documents of minor importance, and obtained some depth of background by judicious description of customs and ceremonies (e.g. at school and Universities) in which Lodge may reasonably be thought to have participated. Two instances of his attempt to give colour to his story however cannot be commended: in describing Lord Mayor's Day he runs extracts from accounts by John Day (1568) and William Smyth (1575) into that by Machyn (1562); and in describing Lodge's voyage with Cavendish he has 'composed' a narrative by running together three accounts, by Cavendish, Knivet and Jane, inserting a passage from Lodge himself into the cento.

Mr Tenney gives a clear idea of Lodge's vicissitudes and general character, yet he fails in his aim 'to draw a full-length portrait'. Here he is in his habit as he lived, the spendthrift, the student, the traveller, the pamphleteer, the recusant, the earnest doctor of medicine, the litigant. But what of the man of imagination behind the lawsuits? In zealously piecing together the mosaic fragments disinterred by other scholars, Mr Tenney has not entirely ignored the poems, romances and plays; but he has not given them the attention which they deserve, which they need if the portrait is to be complete. If, as the author asserts, 'Lodge in his old age must have taken pride in knowing that two great dramatists of the day (Shakespeare and Jonson) would not have been what they were had he never written'; if the Lodge-Gosson quarrel is famous 'because it marks the real beginning of a controversy among English men of letters on the nature, use, function, and censorship of the arts'; and if *Scillaes Metamorphoses* was 'the first of a series of romantic narrative poems', furnishing Shakespeare with a stanza form, a model, and a theme, a detailed examination of such claims is surely necessary in a biographical study of one whose talents were so original and diverse. Mr Tenney's book is more than a compilation, but it is peripheral; it does not cut to the centre.

G. BULLOUGH.

SHEFFIELD.

Shakespeare and the Audience. By A. C. SPRAGUE. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. xii+327 pp. 10s. 6d.

This book is a pleasant and stimulating study of Shakespeare's dramatic technique, and it is not an unfriendly criticism to add that it would not have been written had not Dr Granville Barker's *Prefaces* come first. Dr Sprague's intention is to show Shakespeare's practical

difficulties in writing plays for his own theatre. He treats the subject broadly, and touches on most aspects of dramatic technique—soliloquy, the chorus character, the delineation of villains, the prologue and its functions, the various methods of conveying necessary information about situation or character, and the like. For an honours student, who is not yet concerned with the headier academic problems, the book is to be commended; it will stimulate his enjoyment in reading the plays. Dr Sprague's illustrations are apt; he does not forget that he is writing about stage plays; and many of his conclusions are backed by his own experience as a playgoer. There is, however, one serious criticism of Dr Sprague's method which he admits in his preface. He has—to quote his own words—proceeded 'as if the First Folio—and *Pericles*—were wholly the work of one man, writing at one time'. It is a considerable objection; for, although certain devices in Shakespeare's technique occur constantly at all periods, his theatrical art was always changing and developing with his style. Moreover, the response of audiences also changed as their dramatic education improved. In the later tragedies—*Othello*, *Lear*, *Anthony and Cleopatra*—Shakespeare was so sure of their attention that he could start the action moving in the first few lines, and indicate character in the subtlest way. Audiences of the early 1590's were not capable of much subtlety. Indeed, the development of technique in the Elizabethan theatres between 1590 and 1605 was as rapid as the development of technique in the cinema between 1920 and 1935. Dr Sprague is however concerned more with general principles than with tracing changes.

G. B. HARRISON.

LONDON.

Ben Jonson on the English Stage, 1660–1776. By ROBERT GALE NOYES. (*Harvard Studies in English*, xvii.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. viii+351 pp. 15s.

This volume combines the merits of a critical study and a sober compilation. By patient research among newspapers, playbills, reviews and a host of miscellaneous writings Dr Noyes has been able to amplify very considerably Genest's records of performances of Jonson's plays on the London stage between the Restoration and the retirement of Garrick, as can be seen from the chronological list given in his appendix. But Dr Noyes does far more than accumulate dates. For instance, his discussion of the actors in the various revivals and of their individual interpretations of their rôles gives a clear picture of the acting tradition in Jonsonian comedy. More important still, his liberal quotation of criticisms prompted by specific performances or by general reflections on Jonson and his analysis of the manner in which the plays were adapted for later eighteenth-century audiences provide valuable illustrations of the changes in the dramatic tastes of the period.

An opening chapter indicates the main currents in Jonsonian criticism from 1660 to 1776:

There was an intense admiration for his robust personality; a definite appreciation of his dramatic virtues, illustrative of the standards of the century from Dryden to

Dr Johnson, which singled out for special commendation his correctness and judgment, his adherence to nature, his satirical power, his technical excellence in plots and drawing of characters of humors. The critics admitted freely his faults, which consisted primarily of a too servile imitation of classic models, a lack of interest in love, and an inadequate representation of women, all of which rendered his comedies cold and cynical (p. 5).

Jonson suffered, too, from uncritical comparisons with Shakespeare. However, the brilliant acting of Garrick and his contemporaries, assisted by judicious pruning of such features as tended to stamp the plays as museum pieces, preserved the theatrical life of the great comedies in spite of changing tastes; but with the retirement of Garrick their stage history practically terminated.

The bulk of Dr Noyes's volume is concerned with *Volpone*, *The Alchemist*, *Epicoene* and *Every Man in his Humour*. *Bartholomew Fair* enjoyed great popularity during the Restoration period, but it dated so rapidly that its eighteenth-century stage history is negligible. *Every Man out of his Humour* and *Catiline* had but slight appeal, while of Jonson's other plays Dr Noyes makes no mention. The theatrical career of the four plays first mentioned was brilliant. *The Alchemist*, *Volpone* and *Epicoene*, in that order of popularity, held the stage as repertory pieces with few intervals until 1776. There were, for example, no less than fifty-eight performances of *Volpone* between 1700 and 1710. *Every Man in his Humour*, on the other hand, flourished late, the majority of its one hundred and fifty performances being confined to the last twenty-five years of Garrick's management. The relative shares of Jonson and his interpreters in the success of these pieces is estimated by Dr Noyes from contemporary criticisms.

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

Georgic Tradition in English Poetry. By DWIGHT L. DURLING. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1935. xii+259 pp. 15s.

Didactic and descriptive verse was increasingly the popular form of English poetry in the eighteenth century. Reverence for Virgil, the poet who dealt most elegantly with men's everyday affairs and sentiments, was at its highest. For Dryden and Addison the *Georgics* was 'the best poem of the best poet'. Thomson, in *The Seasons*, adapted the Georgic form to modern thought, and by his success gave a determining impetus to the didactic-descriptive tendencies of his century. At length Wordsworth, the poet, appeared. Such might be a brief summary of a century of English poetry.

Mr Durling's *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry* is valuable in two ways. It is, in the first place, a historical study of the importance of Thomson in eighteenth-century literature. It examines a form, successfully adapted by him, which persisted for nearly a hundred years. 'In the eighteenth century there were two types of verse strongly influenced by the Georgic genre: poems on country occupations, and poems on typical, unlocalised appearance of nature. A third type of verse, the poem of

local description... showed after 1750 important features drawn from the other two genres.' These three broadly defined types are the subject of the book. A mass of material, mostly forgotten and generally ignored, has been sorted and sifted. It has been done well. Sense of proportion is never lost, and museum specimens are not labelled as works of high art. The main defect of the work as a book is that the mere mass of names tends to oppress the reader, but this does not lessen its value as a work of reference. A chapter on the English Virgil is followed by another on the poetry of country occupations, with attention paid to its changing nature. A lengthy chapter on descriptive verse, interesting especially for its account of the influence of the growing interest in natural history after 1770, leads on to a suggestive summary of the tendencies formative of the mind of Wordsworth.

This is the second aspect in which the book is valuable. It deals with verse rarely in itself of more than third-rate merit, but it makes impossible any other conclusion than that 'observation of nature, reflection of country life, and a definite philosophy of nature did not wait for the maturity of the famous poets of the English romantic school'. Wordsworth, like Burns, inherited a great legacy, both of form and theme, but as it lacked, till he came, the irradiation of poetic genius, it lacked all.

W. D. THOMAS.

SWANSEA.

The Literary Career of Sir Joshua Reynolds. By FREDERICK WHILEY HILLES. Cambridge: University Press. 1936. xx+318 pp. 15s.

Mr Hilles's task was worth performing and he has done it well. Without indulging in any 'poor Sir Joshua!'s, we may say that to bring the great man on as an art critic or any other sort of critic to-day required some courage, which is duly rewarded in the successful writing of this book. It is not simply that Sir Joshua's ideas are all demoded to-day. Almost everything he stood for either in his theory of painting or literary criticism is now regarded, and not in very advanced circles, as pompous trifling. Wherever he could go wrong, he goes wrong with deplorable complacency. But he had the suffrages of nearly all England, and this gives the record of his intellectual life any interest it possesses. As we follow Mr Hilles's narrative, we are aware that we are watching the almost cruel exposure of official opinion in any age. The nearest parallel to Sir Joshua is Ruskin, who has had the same bad luck with posterity both as art and literary critic; but we never feel, as we do with Ruskin, that we would like to break a lance for him. We have a tenderness for the crotchets of the Victorian Don Quixote, which we never have for the entirely official Reynolds.

But Mr Hilles does not permit himself the pleasure of demolishing his subject. He rightly conceives his business to be the placing of the material before us and this he has done with research which he never allows to appear laborious. He has his asides, of course, which are more damaging in the long run, perhaps, to the honesty and good faith of Reynolds as an author than his character as a critic. His use of authors,

of unacknowledged quotations or borrowings from the book he had just laid down, and his general pretence of classical culture are fully, but not ungenerously, exposed. His ambition of being an elegant author, and to be known as a patron and adviser of authors, is treated with the lenience due to the age he lived in.

The famous Discourses naturally provide Mr Hilles with the main substance of his book, and here he gives us just the aid we required. How the various Discourses came into being, the authors resorted to, the effect of contemporary criticism on later Discourses and later editions, and the astonishing vogue of the species in the fashionable world, these things are all treated with exemplary fullness and detail. It is really important to the student to examine the chips from the workshop that Mr Hilles produces from the commonplace books preserved at the Royal Academy and elsewhere. It is really interesting to see Reynolds adjusting later discourses to meet the objections of even anonymous pamphleteers. The open mind? Well, hardly; one finds it difficult to believe in the custodian of official opinion being accessible there. For example, everyone knows that the most disabling features of the Discourses is their tendency to generalization and their tendency to depreciate genius. Mr Hilles tells us that Reynolds's method was to begin a lecture as a painter talking to students and then go off on the high *a priori* way. An anonymous and abusive critic in 1774 said some damaging things about Sir Joshua's methods and notions of art theory. The opening remarks of the next Discourse excuse the generalization habit—the details of the art he has 'always left to the several Professors'. But he still decries those who represent painting 'as a kind of inspiration'. The ancients? Ah, well, that is a different matter. There was enthusiastic inspiration there, no doubt. Students of literature know that this was a peculiarly eighteenth-century dilemma. One can never forget that Reynolds in these lectures saw painting through poetry—a third and fatal disablement. Or must we allow that art criticism in every age must borrow its illustration from poetry? Our latest manifesto on art, Professor Read's book on Surrealism, is three parts literary criticism.

Professor Hilles's book will be valued as a piece of scrupulous and clearly-planned scholarship, which enables us for the first time to see an eighteenth-century magnifico of the arts in all his splendour and falsity.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal. By F. L. LUCAS. Cambridge: University Press. 1936. 280 pp. 8s. 6d.

Mr Lucas has here brought together six essays which all have some bearing upon the eternal debate concerning the nature and significance of Romanticism and Classicism. Mr Lucas does not deal with the question in the manner indicated by his title, that is, in chronological and historical narrative. He is surveying his field with an eagle's eye, in a series of flights, and does not proceed from China to Peru by time-table. The

title, indeed, is only intended to apply strictly to the first three chapters, which form a whole in themselves. The rest are more miscellaneous, and the final chapter, with travel-notes on Iceland and the Sagas, has but little connexion.

Mr Lucas is nothing if not critical, and as frank and fresh as he is independent. He has no small right to his independence, for it is justified by an adequate classical training, and full, wide, and accessible reading. He is ready to lock horns with Johnson or Coleridge impartially, and on occasion can toss and gore the appropriate enemy, whether it be Dr Richards or certain coteries of modern poets. The general effect is one of lively and active sanity of judgement, underlying a sensitive, warm and catholic apprehension of beauty. Here is a stimulating book which does not depend for its interest upon eccentricity; which dares to be conservative and well-informed, and whose entertaining quality is the legitimate child of true scholarship.

Whether Mr Lucas's formulae, of the opposed forces of self-expression and of self-control, the expression of the conscious and the release of the unconscious, satisfy or not, may be a matter for debate. They certainly help towards understanding. And he is fully aware of the multitudinous currents that flow in one main stream, as of the crossing and mingling of the streams. My main doubt is whether enough account is taken, in all such analyses, of the power of great individual geniuses. With this may be linked the possible view of classicism as the later stage of inspiration or excitement to art, the stage of craftsmanship supervening and seeking to prolong an art. So the debate continues. We would not have it come to an end, so long as it produces books like this, with its rich allusiveness and vivid, epigrammatic quality.

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

The History of the English Novel. Vol. VII. *The Age of Dickens and Thackeray.* By ERNEST A. BAKER. London: Witherby. 1936. 404 pp. 16s.

With unflagging industry Dr Baker has brought his survey down to the early nineteenth century. The river of English fiction now becomes so wide that it is difficult to see across; it is a river in flood, and all will wonder through how many more volumes Dr Baker's enthusiasm will keep him afloat. He calls the age of Dickens the heyday of the novel, on the ground that novelists then received the highest prices and the output was so enormous. But Cazamian has given the average annual output from 1816 to 1851 as only 100, while according to *The Publishers' Circular* it had risen by 1870 to 200, and by 1894 to 1315. Will even Dr Baker be able to read them all? But however it may be with numbers (and as some may think with the quality of the writing, which seems to me to show a clear deterioration in the extracts of this volume) the first half of the century was unmistakably a heyday of the novel in another sense—

the important novelists were then the popular novelists, the division of the ways coming later with a vastly expanded market. Dickens and Thackeray are the most prominent figures in the present volume, and perhaps the first signs of a fissure are already to be seen between them. The Brontës, Mrs Gaskell, and some others are held over for the time being. The earlier chapters are concerned with Irish fiction, the historical novel after Scott (the mid-century exhaustion of this type is noted at the end of the chapter, but Kingsley and Reade have yet to be considered). Peacock finds himself in a chapter with Disraeli and Lytton, and there is an interesting treatment of the immediate precursors of Dickens. All students of the novel are by now acquainted with the general characteristics of Dr Baker's work. With unflinching care and interest, though with a certain flatness of critical effect perhaps inevitable in a history of this kind, he has listed, quoted, described and discussed more novels than anybody else has ever read. There is no attempt to interpret them as expressions of personality, which indeed in this period would be to take most of them too seriously as works of art, and Dr Baker is an historian, not a 'psychological' critic; nor is there any endeavour to relate this mass of writing to the temper and demands of the age (except in passing comments—the insistence for example on the contemporary desire for instruction as well as amusement helps to explain the growth of the documentary method in England and to make Reade with his famous filing cabinets a less surprising anticipation of French naturalism). But criticism is abundant in his work, applied to the novels *seriatim* and to the more important figures in balanced summaries. Perhaps those who seek information will come away more satisfied than those who seek critical enlightenment. The historian seems to be well aware of those defects of vision and deep human comprehension which many readers feel in early Victorian fiction, even the best, yet is little troubled by them, finding 'compensation' in other things. But can there be any compensation for defects of vision in the arts? Dickens for example is compared at various times to Cervantes, to Dante, to 'Holy Writ'; he 'knew the worst in human nature and believed in the best', 'knew the beauty of goodness and the ugliness of evil'. Many will find this very excessive. Is it not difficult to suppose from the novels that Dickens knew much about good and evil at all, except in their simplest forms? Does Bill Sykes represent the worst in human nature? or Joe Gargery (with 'the innocent heart of a child') the best? If the memory rests for a moment on Tolstoi's Pierre Bezukhov and Prince Andrew all Dickens's world at once becomes fairyland, delightful fairyland though it sometimes be; and Thackeray's, though liker to the world we know, seems a somewhat shrunken version of it. Dr Baker is of course well aware of this, but his admissions often take a good deal of the meaning from his praise, they lie too artificially together. After these cavils it remains only to pay respect to the great merits this volume shares with its predecessors, the merits which make a standard history valuable—order and clarity, judicious selection of information, accuracy of reference, the careful mapping of disordered and sometimes little known ground, and perhaps not least the provision of an

illuminating anthology of extracts for those not so minutely acquainted with the undergrowths of fiction as the author.

R. D. WALLER.

MANCHESTER.

The Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes. Edited with an introduction by H. W. DONNER. London: Oxford University Press. Humphrey Milford. 1935. lxiv+834 pp. 25s.

The Browning Box or The Life and Works of Thomas Lovell Beddoes as reflected in letters by his friends and admirers. Edited with an introduction by H. W. DONNER. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1935. lxxvi+190 pp. 15s.

Thomas Lovell Beddoes. The Making of a Poet. By H. W. DONNER. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1935. 10+404 pp. 18s.

Beddoes deserves editing and, owing to his methods of composition and the fragmentary nature of his surviving work, needs careful editing more than many poets who have received it long ago. The editions of Kelsall and Gosse were incomplete and, in spite of all Dr Donner's research, it is possible that other fragments may yet turn up; but it is not likely that his edition will ever be superseded. It is a monument of patience and thoroughness, including not only all the poems known hitherto—and among them an unabridged and variorum text of *Death's Jest-Book*—but many hitherto unpublished fragments, letters and other prose works and even the German writings of Beddoes recovered from Swiss and German newspapers. There are also a chronological table of Beddoes's life and works, various appendices, notes on the poems, and a bibliography, and illustrations of which the most striking and appropriate are the reproductions of John Stephen of Calcar's woodcuts to Vesalius.

The other two volumes here reviewed may be looked upon as subsidiary tasks in Dr Donner's main endeavour, that of making the poetry of Beddoes better known, since of him more than of most poets it may be said that the poetry reflects the man. The MSS. contained in the original 'Browning Box' disappeared many years ago; they may yet be found, and it will then be amusing to see how correct Dr Donner has been in his guess that the collection of letters in his book is 'such a one as Kelsall might have wished to assemble in the box bequeathed to Robert Browning'. What he gives us is the Dykes Campbell transcripts from those MSS., and in addition 'all the contemporary evidence about Beddoes that could conveniently be brought within the frame of the present collection.' The result is a book of considerable interest in itself, made more useful by the notes and by the introduction in which Dr Donner gives sketches of the friends of Beddoes—Proctor, Revell Phillips, Bourne and Kelsall, to the last of whom it may not unfairly be said that the poetic survival of Beddoes is due.

Kelsall's memoir and the Beddoes material in Swiss and German archives and newspapers are omitted for reasons of bulk from *The Browning Box*, but are drawn upon for Dr Donner's biographical and critical

study. On the biographical side it is not likely that his book can be shaken, and there is much for admiration and agreement on the critical side. The introductory chapter on the poetic drama of the nineteenth century has much sense and wit; there is, as Dr Donner says, a subtle distinction, though it is not always easy to draw, between the pseudo-heroic and the deliberately Elizabethan in these dramas, and he does well to point out that, though 'the poets who set themselves the task of reviving the drama had not a notion of dramatic technique' (pp. 25-6), the writers of 'dramatic poems' and 'dramatic scenes' had some share in laying the foundation for the later analytical drama of the human mind (p. 11). One may agree also with his remark that 'the trouble with the Romantics was that they did not know what a villain was' (p. 28)—all their villains are too noble, and act in a moment of temporary aberration without a good Elizabethan motive of revenge; and having agreed, one may be surprised that he does not see the exceptions in Beddoes himself. Thus of Melchior in *Torrismond* Dr Donner writes, 'Verisimilitude is added to the figure of the traitor by his alien birth which prevents him entertaining that affectionate loyalty for his master's house which inspires the actions of the other courtiers' (p. 147). But it was not his alien birth which prevented Melchior from entertaining affectionate loyalty for his master's house—

God help the miserable velvet fellow!
It seems he has forgot that little story,
How he debauched my poor, abandoned sister,
And broke my family into the grave.
That's odd; for I exceeding well remember it,
Though then a boy. (Act I, iv, 48-53.)

Melchior had as good a motive for revenge as any Elizabethan hero-villain, and the Duke's forgetfulness is equally in the convention. A reader may also feel that Dr Donner is too eager to catch echoes (e.g. on pp. 164, 178 n., 217—but he is certainly right in the acute remarks on pp. 223-4), though he is conscious both of this danger and of the other, that of psychological speculation on insufficient evidence, into which he sometimes seems to fall. Sometimes disagreement may be due to a misunderstanding of his intention: there is very occasionally a foreign phrase or turn of the sentence ('In a similar manner was all the poetry of early nineteenth-century tragedy only an outer garment without a corresponding inner life' (p. 5), and (p. 6) 'Cartesius'), and when Dr Donner says, for instance (pp. 142-3), that *Old Adam*, the *carrion crow* is 'capital fun' and 'funny', he may mean 'admirably grotesque'. Beddoes's humour was grotesque, gruesome, or coarse, never funny: it was too close to that of the jailer in *The Yeomen of the Guard* for so innocent an adjective to be applied to it. Whether he was born with a churchyard imagination, or whether, as Dr Donner suggests, making perhaps too much of some phrases of the elder Beddoes, he played with human bones in his infancy and thenceforward could not escape from the thought of death, the effect was the same. Browning's criticism is the true one: 'He was to despoil Death of his horrors... he does exactly the reverse', and

Dr Donner adds (pp. 193-4). 'A long familiarity with the subject may to some extent have numbed Beddoes' senses with regard to the horrible; and he may have been able to laugh where others could not.' The quest for a solution in surgery and science of the problems of life and death was accompanied and concluded with mocking laughter, which is endurable only for the sake of the power and delicacy which also formed part of that twisted poetical genius.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

The Conquest of Constantinople. Translated from the Old French of ROBERT OF CLARI by EDGAR HOLMES MCNEAL. (*Records of Civilization*. No. xxiii.) Pp. 150. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1936. \$2.75 and 14s.

This English translation of Robert of Clari's account of the Fourth Crusade, from the preaching of Fulk to the death of the Emperor Henry in 1216, deserves a hearty welcome. The introduction deals thoroughly with all that is known about Robert (who was a vassal of Pierre of Amiens and took part in the Crusade as a simple knight), and with the historical value of his chronicle. The manuscript of the account is preserved in the Royal Library at Copenhagen. It was not printed till 1868, and then only in a few copies, one of which is apparently that referred to by Sir Frank Marzials in the note on p. 63 of his 'Everyman' translation of Villehardouin as being in the British Museum. This was followed by the text of Karl Hopf in his *Chroniques gréco-romanes*. The best text is that of Lauer, published in 1924. The present translation preserves admirably the straightforward and unadorned style of the original, and the volume concludes with a full and up-to-date bibliography and an adequate index.

Robert's narrative is full of interest and on the whole remarkably accurate. It is valuable too for the contrast it presents to the more official account of the Marshal Villehardouin. The very simplicity of the story enhances its credibility and helps us to view this discreditable 'Crusade' in its proper light. It is probable that at the start even the Venetians were fired with a certain amount of religious enthusiasm, but it is only too clear that the commercial factor was predominant with them. The other Crusaders were driven by their indebtedness to help in the capture of Zara, and then to assent to the attack on Constantinople. There is one specially striking instance of Robert's straightforwardness as opposed to the diplomatic perversion of facts by Villehardouin. On p. 45 of this translation we find the Doge saying: 'If we could have a reasonable excuse for going there [to Constantinople]... it would seem to me a good plan.' The excuse was found in sending envoys to the young Alexius in Germany, offering to restore him—at a price. Villehardouin (Marzials's trans. p. 22) says that the Crusaders were approached by Philip of Swabia and Alexius. There seems little doubt that Robert's version is to be preferred.

This well-produced volume quite fulfils the aim of the series—to make

accessible to English readers texts aiding an understanding of the past, and to bring within the reach of non-specialist readers the fruits of modern scholarship. It is to be regretted that the scope of the series did not permit of the printing of the French text in conjunction with the English translation.

F. H. MARSHALL.

LONDON.

Les Débuts de P. Corneille. By L. RIVAILLE. Paris: Boivin. 1936. 807 pp. 60 fr.

A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century. Part III: *The Period of Molière.* By H. C. LANCASTER. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford. 2 vols. 896 pp. 45s.

French scholarship seems to be changing in character. Instead of the essay, 'étude' or monograph, we have 'enquêtes' and theses that rival in bulk the productions we associate with Germany and America. There is not much to choose in expansiveness between the large volumes on twenty years of French drama, and the eight hundred pages on the first plays of Corneille. But the American book is easier to read, because it is much more accurately printed. The number of misprints in M. Rivaille's volume is excessive. If a reviewer notes over eighty that must be well within the actual number. Mistakes in the bibliography indicate a lack of acquaintance with German, and it is unfortunate that the one recent book which attempts a rehabilitation of Corneille's plays should have escaped both M. Rivaille and Mr Lancaster.

A careful reading of these eight hundred pages leaves one with the impression that they should have been six hundred. There is considerable overlapping of chapters. The first half of the book is summed up and in many points repeated in an otherwise excellent chapter XII, which again is resumed in the expansive conclusion (pp. 743-77). Much of the quotation and analysis of style might have been summarized or referred to in notes rather than at length in the text.

But these are blemishes on a study that contains not merely considerable research, but a freshness of approach and ability of treatment of which Corneille has hardly had his fair share. The available information about his first plays is meagre, and excellently treated in two chapters, followed by a penetrating analysis of the plays themselves. (I cannot quite see why the chapter on psychology should be called 'L'Intérêt'.) The third part entitled 'L'Originalité de Corneille', consisting of two very long chapters on 'La Pensée' and 'L'Art', is an attempt in default of external evidence to find 'le créateur derrière l'énigme de sa création'.

This is the original part of the book. No other student of Corneille has to my knowledge attempted anything of the kind, except Klemperer in a necessarily summary way. I consider M. Rivaille completely successful in his attempt to show that the mental attitudes and form of the plays can tell us much about the art and ideas of their creator. Here at last is laid the ghost of the 'objective classic', whose subjects were unrelated to his own emotional and intellectual life. These pages make it abundantly

clear that the first works of Corneille are a personal reproduction of those features of human nature in which he took most interest. This is not only a new departure in French dramatic criticism; it may well become the standard of criticism for Corneille's masterpieces as well as of his first attempts.

M. Rivaille's method, however, satisfies me more than do his conclusions. There is a thesis in this book, frequently stated, which is that Corneille's methods of argument and expression, his main ideas and emphases, are products of his Jesuit education and of the acquaintance with scholastic philosophy that it gave him. The case is on the positive side excellently made out, and leaves one convinced that the parallels between scholastic arguments and the behaviour of Corneille's characters are due to the extent to which the dramatist possessed (whether ingrained or appropriated) belief in reason, the will, the supremacy of the intellect over the senses and passions.

But this is only fully acceptable if the other currents of opinion to which Corneille was equally accessible are fully explored. I do not feel that they are. To begin with, it is likely that Corneille was a careful if not a wide reader. Yet his debts to antiquity (despite an admitted influence of Seneca on style, pp. 697-9) and to Spain are dismissed in a page. I do not know that Huszar was right in his claims for Spanish influence, but I should like to see the question examined. Further, that peculiar feature of French classicism, the habit of considering the human spirit as identical in every man, can hardly be considered apart from Montaigne, who has no place in this volume. Most important of all, stoicism, a movement so widespread in Corneille's day, and nowhere more strongly than in his native town, could surely furnish a good case for influence precisely in regard to those qualities attributed to the Jesuits. M. Strowski has put the point more ably than I can (*De Montaigne à Pascal*, pp. 122 f.). It is curious that Du Vair's name occurs only in passing and that the revival of stoicism is not mentioned as of importance for Corneille's thought. This means that important conclusions are reached on less than adequate evidence, and one would have sacrificed many things in the first half of the book for a fuller discussion here.

With Mr Lancaster's stately history we enter another world of scholarship. I think his own last paragraph is the best summary of the scope and variety of the investigations which fill these two volumes:

The more than 300 plays that have survived from these 21 years mark the decay of tragi-comedy, despite the effort to renew its life by use of the term *comédie héroïque*; the momentary and limited revival of the pastoral play; Corneille's interesting innovations in tragedy; Racine's first great successes; the development of the 'machine' play and the creation of *comédie-ballet*, both of which prepare the way for opera; and the triumph of farce, comedy of manners and comedy of character, due especially to the productions of Molière, who gave to the comic spirit its most complete expression and profoundly influenced modern drama both in his own country and outside of it (p. 861).

This vast field is covered with unfailing vigilance. The accuracy and the concision with which the facts of each play are recorded must make Mr Lancaster's memory no less than his learning the envy of young

researchers. Since I was responsible for frank criticism of his earlier volumes in this journal (1935, pp. 99 f.), I am the more anxious to state my respect for the valuable matter here offered and for the excellence of its presentation.

The author's minute study of the sources of practically every play extant provides a mass of new material for scholars who wish to reconsider such hoary questions as the influence of Spanish drama in France, or the connexion between novel and drama. This latter is more interesting than we have assumed. Not only were many dramatic plots taken from contemporary novels, but the plays read like novels, as catering for the same curiosity as the novels; there is the same love of incident, of realism, of the improbable and the heroic.

The centre of interest in these two volumes is of course Molière, and here I think that Mr Lancaster's treatment will be claimed as one of the most successful parts of his history. It is refreshing to find the old legends swept decisively away, and to be put face to face with the plays, unhindered by autobiographical considerations as to Molière's marriage or his melancholy or the political allusions in *Amphitryon*. The real novelty of these chapters lies in the constant comparison with the work of contemporaries. We see Molière's work in something like true perspective when we are shown the flood of similar productions, the rivalry between the three Paris theatres and their actors, the likelihood of an actor-author such as Molière making use for his own writing of plays that he had himself staged rather than of inaccessible material in a foreign tongue.

Where so much information is given it will seem churlish to require more, but I am still disturbed by the title of the work. The treatment of every play is on the same plan: discussion of sources, structure, characters and success on the stage. With the mass of facts that this treatment involves it is impossible at times to see the wood for the trees. We are reading a collection of admirable materials and fruit of research, but not a history. Questions of theory, for example, in a period which includes the publication of Corneille's *Discours* and D'Aubignac's *Pratique du Théâtre* ought not to be banished to a section in a very general introductory chapter. Because the rules were laid down Mr Lancaster judges every play by them, and a large proportion are condemned as 'violating' this or that unity. Coming as frequently as it does, the word suggests a rigidity which I believe never existed. Certain theorists prescribed the rules, many authors observed them, but I see no evidence that they were binding on the rest or were even generally accepted. As Mr Lancaster himself well says: 'The Classical Age is thoroughly classical only to those who refuse to consider more than a portion of the facts' (p. 849). These volumes show plenty of cases in which authors were concerned with the effect—in the most melodramatic sense—rather than with the unity of their plays.

More serious perhaps is the absence in this history of any attempt at a morphology of drama. Mr Lancaster considers comedy as being very much in the seventeenth century what it is now, essentially the same in the hands of Corneille and of Molière. That Molière created a new type of

comedy, that the modern sense of the word does not describe the essential in Molière's greater plays, these things are never so much as hinted. We are told (p. 856) of 'the healing power of his merriment' and of his mastery of the 'essentials of comic structure and of comic style', but in a history of French dramatic literature such views are, I submit, quite inadequate. Molière is the master of that literature, not because he wrote funnier or more lively plays than anyone else, but because he wrought a revolution in the nature of comedy. *Tartuffe* presents an attitude to life that can only be called comic after a most delicate definition of terms, and which consists in something far more fundamental than humour or skilful portrayal of character.

W. G. MOORE.

OXFORD.

The Revival of Pascal. By D. M. EASTWOOD. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1936. xii+212 pp. 12s. 6d.

The immediate interest of this work is its account of French thought in the last two or three decades before the great war. In relation to this period, Pascal has a double importance: his strangely personal doctrine directly influenced such writers as Duhem and Leroy, and the vigour of his style led some thinkers to reproduce a Pascalian colour in the expression of ideas which were not originally, or at all, Pascalian. (In this latter category we may reckon Bergson and Blondel, if, indeed, there is anything Pascalian in either of their systems. Miss Eastwood's attempt to prove a direct influence of Pascal on *L'Action* and the *Lettre sur les exigences* is not convincing.) The contemporary *succès* of Pascal thus gives unity to a study of Poincaré, Bergson, Blondel, Laberthonnière, and their various followers, which is, in the strict sense, masterly. The careful and penetrating analysis, and the exposition—no less lucid than sympathetic—are equally admirable.

It was inevitable that much 'pure' Pascalian criticism should enter into a book of this kind. Miss Eastwood's approach to each problem in this field is fresh, her conclusions often original. She is too modest in referring to Strowski ('le cœur est vraiment créateur') the genesis of her own brilliant account of Pascal's 'intellectual method'. In her discussion of Laberthonnière, she is perhaps inclined to overlook the absolute rigidity of Pascal's demarcation of the supernatural from the natural (*charité* and *esprit*; Fragment 793). Thus, on p. 137, we read: 'The *cœur* alone, then, can affect the transition from the natural to the supernatural order'—a sentence nearly meaningless as it stands, and contrary to Pascal's thought if we suppose 'affect' a misprint for 'effect'. This 'transition', for Pascal, is a free gift, only negatively prepared by man ('il faut s'offrir par les humiliations'), and given, perhaps, as much to the *automate* and the *esprit* as to the *cœur*. Yet this chapter as a whole is further proof of Miss Eastwood's originality, for Desgrappes' *Études* cannot have appeared before her work was completed. Only in her discussion of Pascal's Jansenism is she content to leave Pascalian criticism much as she found it. It is, however, sad that we cannot know how she arrived at her

interpretation of *justice* and *miséricorde* as 'corresponding' to transcendence and immanence (pp. 100-1); why she used the word 'lack' (rather than 'want') in connexion with 'tu ne me chercherais pas'; and what were the foundations for her theory of Pascal's 'mysticism'.

N. J. ABERCROMBIE.

EXETER.

Au temps de l'Encyclopédie: l'Académie de Dijon de 1740 à 1793. Par ROGER TISSERAND. Paris: Boivin. 1936. 683 pp. 70 fr.

Les concurrents de J.-J. Rousseau à l'Académie de Dijon pour le prix de 1754. Par ROGER TISSERAND. Paris: Boivin. 1936. 219 pp. 30 fr.

Le premier ouvrage, thèse principale pour le doctorat ès-lettres, apporte une contribution substantielle à l'histoire de l'esprit public en France au 18^e siècle, et se rattache, comme tel, à une série de publications antérieures. Sur l'ensemble du mouvement M. Mornet a publié en 1933 ses *Origines intellectuelles de la Révolution française* où il définit le rôle des académies de province: elles n'étaient qu'une vingtaine en 1748: en 1768 on en comptait une quarantaine. Sur la vie intellectuelle en Bourgogne nous possédions déjà les études de l'abbé Deberre (*La vie littéraire à Dijon au 18^e siècle*, 1902) et de Marcel Bouchard (*De l'humanisme à l'Encyclopédie: l'esprit public en Bourgogne sous l'ancien régime*, 1930). Limitant son enquête, pour la faire plus détaillée et plus précise, M. Tisserand s'est attaché à retracer l'histoire de l'Académie de Dijon, dont la fondation fut relativement tardive (1740), mais qui acquit très vite un grand prestige. Elle compta parmi ses membres des écrivains ou des savants comme Voltaire, Buffon, Daubenton, le président de Brosses, le marquis d'Argens, Crébillon père et fils, des artistes comme Rameau et Greuze. Elle appartient à l'histoire littéraire, ne serait-ce que, par les deux sujets qu'elle proposa en 1750 et 1754, et qui suggérèrent à Rousseau les deux retentissants *Discours* auxquels il dut sa soudaine célébrité.

Ayant dépouillé les volumineux registres manuscrits de l'académie, ainsi que ses archives, M. Tisserand a pu reconstituer, en détail, son histoire. De même que l'Académie française sortit des réunions de Conrart, celle de Dijon fut précédée par une société littéraire composée de patriciens bourguignons, gens de robe ou d'église, qui se réunissaient, de 1730 à 1746, chez le président Bouhier. Ce fut aussi un parlementaire, Pouffier, doyen du Parlement de Bourgogne, qui, par son testament (il mourut en 1736) institua l'Académie et la dota. Mais, contrairement à la société Bouhier, où se perpétuait la tradition littéraire de l'humanisme bourguignon, l'Académie, telle que la concevait Pouffier, devait avoir un caractère nettement scientifique et utilitaire: elle devait organiser des conférences et des concours 'sur les connaissances les plus utiles au public': elle devait limiter ses études à la physique (physiologie, chimie, anatomie, botanique) et à la morale, entendue comme science pratique des mœurs. Cet esprit réaliste, pratique, utilitaire, donc encyclopédique déjà, eut à lutter contre la tradition humaniste, représentée par des hommes comme Richard de Ruffey, qui d'abord prolongèrent, en con-

currence avec l'Académie, l'existence de la société Bouhier, puis entrèrent à l'Académie, et essayèrent d'y faire prévaloir leurs goûts. M. Tisserand fait l'histoire de ces dissensions, qui aboutirent, en 1771, à la retraite de Richard de Ruffey: désormais l'esprit encyclopédique domina, sous l'impulsion de bourgeois savants, médecins ou juristes, comme le Dr Maret, et Guiton de Morveau, jusqu'en 1793, date à laquelle toutes les académies provinciales tombèrent en léthargie.

Une deuxième partie du livre est consacrée aux travaux de l'Académie dans les sciences, les lettres et les arts: de 1740 à 1793, il y eut 1897 mémoires présentés et lus à l'Académie: M. Tisserand les classe et mentionne les plus intéressants. Dans une troisième partie, intitulée 'L'autorité de l'Académie', il passe en revue les sujets qui furent proposés périodiquement pour les prix de l'Académie, ainsi que les sujets des cours publics donnés par elle à Dijon. Les conclusions qui se dégagent de cet exposé détaillé peuvent être présentées ainsi:

1. L'histoire de l'Académie de Dijon reflète une évolution sociale. A une société littéraire aristocratique et fermée, qui existait au début du 18^e siècle, elle a substitué un corps ouvert à tous les mérites, sans distinction de classe sociale, et dans lequel l'élément bourgeois, représenté notamment par des médecins, a rapidement prévalu.

2. A cette évolution sociale correspondit une évolution intellectuelle, l'esprit humaniste cédant peu à peu la place à l'esprit encyclopédique. Aux patriciens lettrés, traducteurs d'Horace ou de Tibulle, rimailleurs de bouquets à Chloris, ou occupés d'archéologie et d'histoire locale, ont succédé, de plus en plus nombreux et influents, des plébéiens préoccupés de connaissances utiles, de chimie, d'agriculture, d'inoculation, d'éducation, de réformes judiciaires, de mesures à prendre contre les épidémies ou contre le paupérisme.

3. Le rôle de l'Académie de Dijon, comme de la plupart des académies de province, fut essentiellement de vulgarisation. Qu'il s'agisse de sciences ou de lettres, on ne lui doit guère de contributions sensationnelles par leur nouveauté ou leur importance. Mais elle représente un effort considérable, et méritoire, d'information et de diffusion des connaissances acquises, notamment par ses cours publics (chimie, botanique, médecine pratique) qui furent très suivis: elle joua un peu le rôle d'une université, à une époque où les universités s'immobilisaient dans les traditions stériles d'un humanisme désuet.

Indépendamment de ces indications générales sur l'évolution de l'esprit public, on trouvera dans l'ouvrage de M. Tisserand—au milieu de bien des détails, qui peuvent paraître oiseux, sur de doctes médecins ou juristes bourguignons qui n'eurent qu'un prestige local et éphémère—de petits faits représentatifs qui ne sont pas sans valeur. Il n'est pas indifférent d'apprendre (p. 217) qu'il y avait à Dijon, en 1768, 60 exemplaires de l'Encyclopédie. Des lecteurs anglais ne liront peut-être pas sans intérêt (pp. 463, 477) qu'en 1789 un académicien de Dijon, Roland de la Platière, faisait, devant ses collègues un peu scandalisés, un éloge enthousiaste de la langue anglaise, et lui promettait l'universalité: il est vrai que son enthousiasme allait non pas à l'Angleterre, pour laquelle il manifestait

une sympathie médiocre, mais au peuple américain, dont il couvrait de louanges les vertus et les institutions.

La thèse secondaire de M. Tisserand est consacrée au concours que l'Académie de Dijon institua en 1754 sur le sujet suivant: 'Quelle est la source de l'inégalité parmi les hommes, et si elle est autorisée par la loi naturelle'. L'Académie reçut 12 mémoires manuscrits, dont celui de Rousseau. Sur ces 12 mémoires, 10 seulement ont été conservés dans les archives de l'Académie. L'un des deux manuscrits manquants est celui de Rousseau, qu'on n'a pu retrouver, non plus d'ailleurs que le manuscrit de son discours de 1750: disparitions regrettables, car le texte de ces manuscrits devait présenter des variantes avec le texte des discours imprimés. M. Tisserand publie les dix mémoires conservés: trois sont restés anonymes: les sept auteurs identifiés sont Lerbert (professeur de droit à Berne), Baulos-Bournan (de Bazas), Marteau (médecin d'Aumale), le marquis d'Argenson (ex-ministre des Affaires Étrangères, et ami de Voltaire), l'abbé Talbert (chanoine et académicien de Besançon), Etasse (étudiant en droit de Rennes), et de la Serre (de l'Oratoire). On sait que Rousseau n'eut pas le prix: les registres de l'Académie mentionnent que son mémoire 'n'a pas été achevé de lire à cause de sa longueur et de sa mauvaise tradition, etc.' Après les violentes critiques que l'Académie de Dijon s'était attirées en couronnant en 1750 les 'brillants paradoxes' de Rousseau, elle ne se souciait pas d'encourir de nouveau le reproche d'encourager des esprits subversifs. Des académiciens pouvaient-ils admettre que 'l'homme qui médite est un animal dépravé'? De bons bourgeois bourguignons pouvaient-ils souscrire au violent réquisitoire de Rousseau contre la propriété? Le prix fut décerné à l'abbé Talbert, avec un accessit pour Etasse: les deux mémoires couronnés exposaient de saines doctrines et présentaient l'inégalité des hommes comme une conséquence du péché, conséquence nécessaire, conforme à la loi naturelle et à la volonté divine. C'était d'ailleurs, avec des variantes, la thèse présentée par la plupart des candidats: seuls un des auteurs anonymes (mémoire n° 3) et le marquis d'Argenson soutenaient une thèse plus hardie et affirmaient que l'inégalité est contraire à la loi naturelle qui fait les hommes égaux et libres. Dans une introduction historique, M. Tisserand donne tous les détails désirables sur le concours: il esquisse aussi, à grands lignes, l'histoire du problème, depuis l'antiquité jusqu'aux temps modernes, en insistant sur le retentissement qu'avaient trouvé en France les théories de Locke, Pufendorf, Grotius, Burlamaqui.

E. EGGLI.

LIVERPOOL.

Les gens d'affaires sur la scène en France de 1870 à 1914. Par S. J. TURCOTTE. Paris: Nizet et Bastard. 1936. 227 pp. [No price stated.]

The subject of Mr S. J. Turcotte's thesis has been given something of a topical interest by recent happenings in France. The evergrowing importance of the role of the business man in French comedy since 1870 is but a reflection of the gradual industrialization of the country, the increasing vogue of speculation and company promoting encouraged by

the development of joint-stock companies, the unholy alliance between finance and politics. As the moneyed bourgeoisie consolidated its power and came more and more to represent, in the eyes of the people, a resurrection of the Ancient Régime with its monopolies and privileges, a defensive, and possibly ultimately offensive, force developed among the workers. It is with the representation on the stage of the character, manners, morals and social function of the business man, and with some of the earlier conflicts between workmen and masters, that Mr Turcotte's book deals.

From *Turcaret* onwards, as he remarks in his rapid preliminary survey, business men had made occasional appearances on the stage. Diderot's fertile suggestion in *Dorval et moi* that *la condition* should be studied instead of *le caractère*, might perhaps have been mentioned, for Diderot came near to being the theoretical precursor of nineteenth-century comedy with its *peinture du milieu*. After a useful chapter on the social environment, Mr Turcotte tackles his main theme. He divides his period into four subperiods, classes his types into subtypes and deals with each chronologically under the subperiods. He gives an analysis of each play, notes on the chief characters, and an occasional paragraph on some point of interest. There is much useful information, the research has been carried out thoroughly and conscientiously and the volume constitutes a valuable repertory of detailed knowledge on the subject. It would have been improved by fuller discussion and a less rigid system of presentation. The bibliography is full and careful.

In a pessimistic conclusion Mr Turcotte deplores the gradual moral decline of the 'gens d'affaires' and their increasingly ingenious knavery. His hope that the Great War had led to a general moral regeneration leads one to reflect sadly on the Stavisky scandals, of which, by the way, some of the plays analysed in this book might be regarded as prophetic.

FREDERICK C. ROE.

ABERDEEN.

Ursprung und Eigenart der älteren italienischen Novelle. By RUDOLF BESTHORN. 201 pp. 9 M.

Die Rahmenerzählung des Decameron: Ihre Quellen und Nachwirkungen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rahmenerzählung. By OTTO LÖHMANN. 232 pp. 9 M. (*Romanistische Arbeiten*, xxii, xxiv.) Halle: Niemeyer. 1935.

These two works of the school of Voretzsch are complementary. Both are dedicated to the study of sources. As the titles indicate, they trace the origin of the tale in Italy before Boccaccio and of the 'Rahmenerzählung'. Taking the *Novellino* in particular as his material, Besthorn endeavours to demonstrate that the origin of the Italian novel is autochthonous: that despite the many and material debts it owes to the *Exempla* and to the Provençal *novas*, the Old Italian novel, as a literary genre, is independent of the tale of antiquity, of the Orient, or of other European countries. Besthorn regards the novels as 'chronicles', con-

sidering those to be the oldest that recount the latest news about local celebrities. Only after this, as it gains popularity, does the Italian tale extend its field and reap the advantage of subjects, incidents, etc. of non-Italian origin. Despite the praiseworthy efforts of Besthorn, this hypothesis, although ingenious, is not convincing. It would not be difficult to prove exactly the opposite, since we can speak of a really Italian novel only from the time when the hypothetical primitive novel had fused with the 'chronicles' of foreign origin. The most striking feature of this carefully prepared work is the comparative study of the sources, in which the author shows extensive knowledge and sound standards of judgement. At times, however, in considering the sources of these early novelists, his deductions presuppose in them faculties of self-expression altogether too limited, while at others he credits them with rather surprising inventiveness. It is a most useful work, a trifle dry perhaps, but practical, and most laudable for the clarity of the exposition of a wealth of material.

The work of Löhmann is superior both in bulk, and in knowledge and handling of the subject, although its proportions are rather unbalanced. The second part (from p. 121) is equipped with a veritable arsenal of references and bibliography. Indeed, down to the most minute historical details, it is certainly well executed (one noteworthy example of this being the convincing proof that Sercambi refers not to 1374 but to 1384). But he limits himself too much by only tracing and describing the 'Rahmenerzählungen' in the post-Boccaccian novel, not only in Italy, but in Europe (and especially in France); here the standards of judgement are too hastily formed and the reasoning somewhat prolix. The first part, however, which deals (at great length and with searching inquiry) with the sources of the Boccaccian 'Rahmenerzählung', is far more successful and conclusive. Löhmann says that the *Decameron* has given its characteristic form as well as its realistic expression of social life to the 'Rahmenerzählung', which comes from the Indian Orient and not from Greece and Rome, nor from the Arab world (which served as a bridge from India). This part of Löhmann's work, based on the plentiful material supplied by studies which go back for more than a century, is most interesting for the clarity of approach, and instructive as showing his opinion. But we might observe that (on p. 71) Boccaccio could have found number 100, for example, in the *Divine Comedy*, which, in certain respects, is perhaps already a true 'Rahmenerzählung'; (on p. 116) the Boccaccian *ballate* are not *sonetti*—and why does he always write 'Sonnett'? In the pages from 118 onwards it is not very convincing to compare the *Decameron* to a Gothic church, then twenty lines later to a 'Renaissance palace in words'. Then (on pp. 127 ff.) it appears that Boccaccio with his 'Rahmen' has really created the fashion of recounting cycles of tales in society.

CURT S. GUTKIND.

LONDON.

The Multiple Stage in Spain during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.

By W. H. SHOEMAKER. Princeton: University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. 151 pp. No price stated.

Catálogo Bibliográfico y Crítico de las Comedias Anunciadas en los Periódicos de Madrid desde 1661 hasta 1819. By ADA M. COE. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. (*Johns Hopkins Stud. in Romance Lit. and Lang.* Extra volume ix.) 270 pp. 16s.

That Cervantes's prologue to the *Ocho Comedias*, 1615, should be the most overworked document in the history of the early Spanish drama shows the extent to which the technical problems of stagecraft in this sphere have been neglected. Mr Shoemaker's comprehensive study, written in 1933, has been anticipated in publication by R. B. Williams's *The Staging of Plays in the Spanish Peninsula prior to 1555* (*Univ. of Iowa Stud. in Span. Lang. and Lit.* 5, 1935), a reconstruction on internal evidence in the better known playwrights that suffers from the omission of Catalonia and from insufficient reference to general European practice. In the limited field of the multiple stage, which means virtually the religious play and which exists in elaborate form from the earliest Spanish records of stagecraft (1399, coronation of Martí I at Saragossa), Mr Shoemaker has taken these two requirements in his very competent stride, and incidentally has considerably shaken Cervantes's authority on the matter. Some evidence comes from stage directions, some from church records of expenditure on dramatic effects and performances, but in the main Mr Shoemaker's method is that of visualizing the minimum requirements necessary to the acting of the eight or nine score plays here analysed.

The vertical multiple stage in Spain is restricted to two levels, Heaven and Earth, the former involving both elaborate decoration and complicated machinery, with the solitary surviving exception of the Majorcan *Consueta del Juy*, which gives to Hell-mouth its own lower level. The combination of vertical and horizontal multiple stages, very frequent in the fifteenth century, becomes very rare in the sixteenth, which is characterized by progressive simplification: settings are reduced in number, locations no longer made specific, and the growing use of the back-stage paves the way to the consecutive technique. The multiple stage none the less was not to disappear. It extends to secular subjects, it overflows from church to palace and square, and on the *carros* of the *autos sacramentales* it persists with splendour throughout the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century—a reluctance to yield to changing fashion that to Mr Shoemaker 'well reflects a fundamental characteristic of Spain and her art'. The sub-stage level, aerial machinery, and the back-stage are links with the secular theatre that, bringing us to the verge of Lope, suggest a possible line of attack on the still vexed problem of his real affiliations, whether with Spanish forerunners or with the *commedia dell' arte*.

Miss Coe's volume will be of immense value to students of the drama, who will breathe a sigh of relief and gratitude at seeing such necessary

spadework now so thoroughly done. Of works listed by Cotarelo in his *Maíz y el Teatro de su Tiempo* only supplementary data are given, and translations of operas and zarzuelas are omitted; this apart, the Catalogue may be held a complete record over a century and a half of all the vagaries of dramatic taste that found an echo in the press. Shakespeare, coming via the French at the turn of the eighteenth century, would appear not to have pleased. *Othello* is a 'disparate dramático', *Macbeth* a recipe for nightmares. *Hamlet* was handicapped: its translator, Moratín the younger (the index confuses father and son), is rapped on the knuckles by a critic for his ignorance of English and scant knowledge of French and Spanish.

The arrangement of the Catalogue is alphabetical by title. An index of authors (one Anon. is so voluminous, in spite of the compiler's labours, that she forbears to list him here) enables the reader to make his way through the maze and incidentally to balance reputations one against another. Calderón, with a start of a century and a half, only beats Comella over the whole course by a short head. The press, however, which noticed many plays that were not acted, doubtless paid no attention to many that were: the infinitely prolific Ramón de la Cruz, 'the great amuser of the public during the whole second half of the eighteenth century' (Mérimée), is represented by a baker's dozen of entries.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

Crónica de Dom João de Castro. By LEONARDO NUNES. Edited with an introduction by J. D. M. FORD. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xxviii + 241 pp. 10s. 6d.

Leonardo Nunes is the author of a history of the second siege of Diu (1546), published by Sr A. Baião at Coimbra in 1925. It was a sketch by an eye-witness and more carefully written up by the author in this chronicle, part of the Patha collection acquired by Harvard University. The second form of the work followed hard on the first, since Nunes wrote this *Crónica* on board ship, amid the perils and stresses of a homeward voyage round the Cape, and finished his work on 22 February, 1550. The older version ended with the end of the siege; this one carries the narrative down to D. João de Castro's death (1548). Though the author intended this *Crónica* to be his definitive contribution to the subject, it has been composed with haste, as may be seen in the occasional errors of grammar, some vulgarisms (e.g. *vegitar* for *visitar*) and phonetic spellings; but also in the want of meretricious ornament and pseudo-philosophizing. It is, in fact, a *relação* rather than an *história* as understood by that age, and like many *relações* it is remarkable for its soldierly directness, vividness of etching, and speed of narrative. 'We are perfectly aware (Professor Ford writes) that Leonardo Nunes cannot qualify for a place of any importance in the annals of Portuguese literature. His two chronicles are devoid of literary graces, as he has admitted in the Dedication of the *Crónica* to Dom Antonio d'Ataide' (p. xxiii). An unfortunate piece of

modesty, perhaps. Nunes has a full and racy vocabulary, especially of Indian terms, clarity of vision and economy of style. He seldom loses himself in pseudo-Ciceronian sentences and is not often turgid. Very few pages pass without some homely proverb, some shrewd comparison, or some keen vision illuminating the narrative. Instances could be multiplied easily. One could hardly wish for a terser, more exact and satisfying account of a tropical tempest than this (p. 43):

A lua nova de mayo os tomou no mar, em que as agoas vivas tem muy grande força, e começouse a fazer vento contraíro muijto mais rijo. Toldarãse os çeos, e mostrarãse hûas escuridões muito grandes. Fozilavã os corruptos ares, e o arco do çeo denúciava tempestades. Chovia muijto, e cõ as grandes correntes faziase escarçeo muy feo e as barrentas ondas que vïam sobir aos çeos. Foy o negocio tal qual eu nũca vy.

To historians Leonardo Nunes admits his open partisanship for his hero, but displays a soldierly fair-mindedness. He can hate and praise in the same breath: 'acabou aly a vida d'um pesimo mouro... hera con tudo valentissimo capitam' (p. 129).

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Kultspiele der Germanen als Ursprung des mittelalterlichen Dramas. By ROBERT STUMPF. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt. 1936. xiv + 448 pp. 14 M.

Only a specialist in comparative religion and folklore would, perhaps, be really competent to value authoritatively this undoubtedly important work, which will pretty certainly arouse much controversy both on the author's main contention and on many points of detail. In this review nothing more will be attempted than to give a general idea of the contents, summarize the main lines of argument, and indicate some of the impressions left after a painstaking reading of the whole volume,¹ and a good deal of re-reading of parts of it.

The aim of the book is to revolutionize our ideas on the origin and the early stages of mediaeval European drama in general and of the mediaeval German drama in particular. If Dr Stumpf is right, we must no longer believe the Easter Plays, Christmas Plays, etc., to have generated spontaneously from the liturgy, beginning with the interpolation of short and piously reverent dramatic representations of episodes from the New Testament accounts of Christ's birth and resurrection, and developing by gradual stages into the elaborate and motley performances calculated to edify and amuse the crowds in the market-places. Instead of this we shall have to ascribe the very first quickening of the church services with dramatic life to the influence, even to the intrusion, of ancient Germanic heathendom, and to see in the Mysteries themselves large scale clerical adaptations of contemporary popular performances of a dramatic character which had originated in ancient Germanic heathen rites. As for the Carnival Plays, in which pre-Christian ingredients have long been

¹ Except for a few quotations in languages of which I am ignorant.

recognized, we shall, if we accept Dr Stumpff's contentions, have to regard them as essentially the direct, though debased, descendants of ancient Germanic dramatic performances connected with fertility festivals held at the approach of springtime.

The arguments used by the author in building up his case are intricate and (necessarily) consist mainly of conjecture; to a great extent, indeed, his conclusions rest on conjectures dependent on other conjectures, which are themselves again dependent on still other conjectures. At the same time it must be admitted that all these conjectures are ultimately based on a great mass of solid evidence here brought together for the first time; that they seem likely, on the whole, to be not far wide of the mark; that they are consistent with each other and with the facts they claim to explain; and that in some cases they offer likely enough explanations of hitherto unsolved difficulties. Even if some of the many interesting suggestions thrown out in passing should prove unconvincing¹ or definitely unacceptable to those best able to judge, and if, on the evidence adduced by Dr Stumpff himself, it would seem probable that the mediaeval drama should not be traced back so one-sidedly to Germanic, but rather to more generally Indo-European (or even still more primitive)² origins, this work must be welcomed as a valuable and stimulating study.

The Shrovetide Plays are dealt with first in a short Part I (pp. 2-34) entitled 'Der Mimus'—a title which leads to a brief discussion of the origins and functions of the mediaeval professional mimes, whom the author regards as representatives rather of Germanic than of classical tradition. Dismissing them, however, as hardly relevant to his main subject, he bases his theory of the pre-history of the Shrovetide Plays mainly on the results of Otto Höfler's investigations into the origins of Germanic folk customs as published in his *Kultische Geheimbünde der Germanen*.³ The Shrovetide Plays that have been preserved have both essential features and minor details in common with many of the popular customs (sword dances, Easter races, processions, masquerades, etc.) whose origin, according to Höfler, goes back to the rites and customs of pagan cult fraternities. Dramatic performances of a character similar to that of the extant Shrovetide Plays must, Dr Stumpff argues, have existed long before these latter were written down or printed. He infers that those earlier performances were, like the popular customs mentioned, handed down from generation to generation by closed fraternities whose prerogative it was to produce them, and that they originated in

¹ E.g., perhaps (p. 21), the proposed etymological connexion of the first syllable of *Fas(t)nacht* and the stem of *faseln* with Greek *πῶς*, Latin *penis*, in view of the coarse jests characteristic of the Fastnachtspiel before Hans Sachs, all the tomfoolery of Carnival, and its suggested origin in phallic festival.

² The author cites numerous remarkable parallels to the Germanic rites and customs not only among other peoples of Indo-European speech but from nearly all parts of the world, including both hemispheres. At one point the present-day German conception of racial values breaks through oddly: 'Es braucht wohl nicht betont zu werden, dass uns dabei irgend eine Gleichsetzung der Germanen mit sog. "primitiven Völkern" völlig fernliegt' (p. 24).

³ Vol. I, Frankfurt a. M., 1934. The MS. of Vol. II was apparently also at Dr Stumpff's disposal.

dramatic items forming parts of ancient pagan religious festivals. These festivals persisted as popular merry-makings even in Christian times and are inveighed against by the clergy from the seventh century onwards.¹ The dramatic performances connected with them, therefore, were rooted in the pagan Germanic religion and social structure; and the participants in them Dr Stumpff believes to have been fraternity members, wearing beards, masks, and special costumes, who actually identified themselves with, and were regarded temporarily as identical, with the mythical beings—gods, demons, ancestors, etc.—they represented. Among the ritual performances were some, it is suggested, deliberately provocative of laughter as a salutary force while at the same time serving a social purpose; performances, for example, involving the trial and punishment, or the holding up to ridicule, of typical or real individuals guilty of unsocial acts. It is from performances of this kind in particular that he derives not only the Shrovetide Play proper with its frequent introduction of such motives, but also the popular *Gerichtsspiele* and *Rugespiele* which developed an independent existence. ‘*Der*² *Ursprung des Fastnachtsspieles . . . liegt in den Schwänken, die eine phallische Dämonenschar . . . im Rahmen der kultischen Vorfrühlingsfeste . . . auszuführen hatte.*’ The parallelism between this theory and some of those advanced in recent years by classical scholars investigating the origins of Attic Comedy is evident.

In Part II, entitled ‘Das Drama’, the author deals with the Mysteries. An exposition of the weak points in the hypothesis of their purely liturgical origin and mainly independent growth is followed by arguments to prove that pagan customs persisted even inside the Christian churches and churchyards, which often occupied sites where the ancient rites had from time immemorial been performed. Numerous passages from mediaeval edicts and other writings are cited to show that again and again in succeeding centuries the higher clergy strove to suppress objectionable songs,³ dances, and even dramatic performances in the churches, sometimes using epithets suggesting a recognition of their heathen character and origin. It seems hardly doubtful that these prohibitions were the outcome of reactions against the opportunist tactics employed by the Church, especially by its lower clergy, while Christianity was still securing its footing among the Germanic tribes; tactics involving the taking over and, so far as possible, the assimilation or adaptation to Christian doctrine and tradition of the pagan festivals and the customs connected with them.

A survey (pp. 193–214) of the attempts already made to reconstruct at least the bare outlines of the pagan ritual dramas as representations of

¹ Their designation as ‘Spurcalia’ (Latin *spurcus*—unclean) Dr Stumpff takes to be indicative of their phallic character. He also connects this word with the Sporkelfrau (weather witch) of certain Rhine districts, and with the Sporkelse in No. 95 of Keller’s *Fastnachtspiele aus dem XV. Jahrhundert*.

² The italics here represent spaced type in the work under review.

³ Including the *winnleod*, the character of which is discussed at length (pp. 102–16). The conclusion reached is that it was a folk-song in the vernacular, and that Grimm, Mullenhoff and Lachmann were probably right in supposing it to have been a love song, though the term may have covered also other songs based on social relationships.

the victory of summer over winter, or the death of the old year and the birth of the new, leads up to investigations of the Easter Plays, Christmas Plays, etc. The author's aim here is to determine: on the one hand, the extent to which these plays incorporated in themselves pagan traditions; on the other, what light they throw on the character and contents of the ritual dramas and of the more popular dramatic performances assumed to have developed from the ancient ritual dramas by the time Christianity was introduced. The Easter Play is examined first, perhaps as offering the most promising and fruitful field for discovering possible or probable intrusion of paganism. Since Easter falls in the early spring, and the pagan spring festivals included (according to Dr Stumpfl and others) representations of the death and resurrection of a central dramatic figure;¹ since, further, many popular springtime customs are admittedly of pagan origin; and since there is also such strong evidence for the persistence of popular dramatic performances even in churches and churchyards, it is at least possible that the first stimulus towards the development of the Easter Play came from secular performances of pagan origin, even that those performances were taken over more or less completely and Christianized. This hypothesis would account satisfactorily for what would otherwise have to be regarded as a surprisingly rapid growth of the full-fledged Easter Play from its modest beginnings; it would also provide a new explanation for the inclusion of such comic scenes as the race to the sepulchre and the buying of the ointment, and would clear up difficulties of detail in the text of some of the plays preserved. In a long section headed 'Das Arztspiel' (pp. 222-319) the author compares the ointment-buying scene of the Easter Plays with secular farces depicting dealings with the quack doctor, who is assumed to be the literary descendant of a medicine man appearing in the resurrection episodes of the pagan ritual drama. He points out that in the Easter Plays there are remarkable parallels to the secular plays: the ointment dealer appears not simply as a dealer but also as a physician; and he has an assistant, named Rubin, and a wife. Moreover this scene sometimes has a short prologue and epilogue like those of the secular plays, which suggests that it was originally an independent piece; clumsy introduction of the three Marys who come to buy ointment, and their subordinate role, suggest that this scene existed before they were forcibly inserted into it; and a number of details in the dialogue and technique (as indicated by stage directions and descriptions) show this scene to have been in general closely akin to the secular plays. The inference that this particular scene of the Easter Plays represents a Christianized pagan ritual performance is further supported by comparison with some Czech Easter Plays which are still more strongly suggestive of a similar conclusion, and which contain bearded figures who, in the author's opinion, correspond to the masked actors performing the ritual plays in heathen times. This long section includes a number of

¹ Originally a fertility demon or god, later a racial ancestor or king; or, in connexion with initiation rites, a contemporary human figure whose death and rebirth symbolized his change of social status and milieu.

subsections full of interesting matter and ingenious combinations and suggestions on e.g.: 'Der Arzt in Kult und Brauchtum' (possible connexions with Wodan), 'Rituelle Tötung', 'Das Ritual von Tod und Auferstehung', 'Rubin, der Arztknecht' (possible metamorphoses of him in Robin Hood, Robin Goodfellow, Knecht Ruprecht, etc.; perhaps derived from a pagan demon belonging to the Wild Hunt; connexions with the Hobbyhorse; and much else), 'Robynsac' (originally having the triple purpose of holding curatives, collecting gifts during cult processions, and making captives in cult rites and performances), 'Rubin in den Schwerttanzspielen, Initiant und Knecht', 'Rubin der Vorläufer' (connexion with 'Der treue Eckhart'), 'Uxor mercatorix' (the domestic strife in which she is involved derived from a *Rügespiel*, or of phallic origin), 'Rituelle Hochzeit', 'Das Arztspiel der Mummers Plays'. In a final subsection the author indicates the need for further investigation to determine in some detail how and by what stages the Easter Play assimilated its pagan elements, and also suggests that the Harrowing of Hell scene found in some of the later plays may derive from a Germanic ritual drama in which was depicted a descent to the realm of the dead—if such a drama can be shown to have existed.

The fifth section of the book (pp. 344-426) deals with the Christmas Play in subsections headed: 'Das heidnische Julfest', 'Das Sternspiel', 'Das Königspiel', 'Eselsfest und Prophetenspiel', 'Die Geburt des Kindes'. Following the same method as in the previous section, large numbers of parallels between the Church plays, secular plays (including the Mummers' Plays) and popular customs connected with the winter solstice are discussed; and the same conclusion is reached—that their origin is to be found in Germanic ritual processions and dramatic representations. Of the many interesting conjectures put forward the two of greatest fundamental importance are: that the Christian clergy replaced the Sun of pagan ritual by the Star of Bethlehem; and that Herod is in the main a Christianized Wodan, the Germanic god of (religious) ecstasy, who lived on both as the Wild Huntsman and as the King of Fools—the Fools themselves being originally a cult fraternity privileged to cultivate and express religious frenzy at the times of the heathen festivals.

A final section insists on an essential difference between the Mysteries as commemorative and imitative reproductions of history, and therefore without real dramatic life, and the Germanic and Greek ritual dramas as symbolically creative in their purpose, and therefore genuinely dramatic. The author also calls for further investigations to determine more exactly how much of its own the Church contributed to the Mysteries, and to reconstruct the ritual drama which he assumes to have grown out of the primitive rites of the Bronze Age and to have reached its highest point of development at some time before the introduction of Christianity.

In conclusion apologies must be offered for a 'review' which is hardly more than a digest. The great amount and variety of the material on which the author's arguments are based, the grasp and ingenuity he shows in using it to support the theories advanced and to refute other

theories, and the interdependence of the arguments in the various sections and subsections, can only be realized by anyone who reads the book itself.

F. E. SANDBACH.

BIRMINGHAM.

Die deutsche Urkundensprache in der Kanzlei Kaiser Karls IV. (1346-78).

By L. E. SCHMITT. *Mitteldeutsche Studien*, Heft 11. Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. 226 pp. 11 M.

That the German literary language originated in the Chanceries is an ascertained fact, but there is a good deal of doubt as to the relations between the different Chanceries. Dr Schmitt attempts a solution. He begins by a careful investigation of the type of language used in imperial documents at Prague under Charles IV. After extending his researches to the Saxon Chancery and that of Nürnberg, he comes to the conclusion that there is no traceable dependence of either the Saxon or the Nürnberg 'Kanzleisprache' on that of Prague. Dr Schmitt is convinced that the literary language did not reach its definite shape in any one centre, but developed along more or less parallel lines in several places.

We are told that too much attention has been paid to phonology as the distinguishing feature of the 'Schriftsprache' and too little attention has been given to its other aspects, e.g. syntax and style. Dr Schmitt does not think that personal initiative, that of the Emperor Charles IV or of any of his officials, was a decisive factor. One important feature of the book is the stress laid on the variations in spelling in the Imperial 'Kanzleisprache'. The author attributes these variations to the habits of individual scribes. He enumerates the officials who were members of the Imperial Chancery under Charles IV. It is important to note that nearly two-thirds of these were not natives of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, but came from the districts of the Rhine and Main, from Magdeburg, from Swabia and so on. The compromise between Middle and Upper German is due to the mixture of scribes, not to the heterogeneous nature of the spoken dialects of Bohemia, and still less to an imaginary 'Hofsprache'. The compromise between Middle and Upper German is just as noticeable in Mainz as in Prague.

Apparently the main part of the book was completed before the appearance in 1934 of *Die Entstehung unserer Schriftsprache* by Alois Bernt. As far as one can gather, Dr Schmitt would not consider that his conclusions were in any way invalidated by Dr Bernt's work, in which the predominance of Prague is the keystone of the whole edifice.

It is unfortunate that the present book is marred by the inclusion of a short chapter on the influence of the Latin *cursus* on the 'Kanzleisprache'. Dr Schmitt states in all seriousness that certain rhythmical phrases that occur in Latin prose find their counterpart in the language of the Prague Chancery and 'Einwirkung des lateinischen Kursus auf die deutschen Satzschlüsse in K ist also vorhanden'. It is sheer pedantry to say that a phrase like 'horen und sehen' owes anything to Latin. I opened a story by Ludwig Thoma at random and found in it the

rhythmical patterns which Dr Schmitt solemnly proclaims as imitations of the *cursus*!

The glossary of words used in the Imperial Chancery gives us a clear conception of the vocabulary of the 'Kanzleisprache'. We note that the substitution of 'gross' and 'klein' for 'michel' and 'lützel' had already taken place. But we hesitate to agree when Dr Schmitt adds the verb 'eigen' to a list of 'veralternde Worte'. Goethe used it frequently four centuries later. I noticed one bad misprint. On p. 68, line 21, 'verderben, gelten, bezahlen' should read 'verderben, gelten (im Sinne von bezahlen)'. As it stands, the statement implies that the verb 'bezahlen' belongs to the third 'Ablautsreihe'.

J. M. CLARK.

GLASGOW.

Ulrich Füetrer's Parzival: Material and Sources. By JAMES BOYD. (*Medium Ævum Monographs*, I.) Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1936. vii + 172 pp. 10s. 6d.

The author's concern is with those episodes of Ulrich Füetrer's *Buch der Abenteuere* which deal with Parzival and Gawein, his aim being to show in what relation these stand to the three sources from which the material is taken, namely, Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*, Heinrich von dem Türlin's *Krone* and *der jüngere Titurel*. This investigation, which occupies the second and major part of Dr Boyd's thesis (Part I is pure introduction), has been carried out with scrupulous thoroughness, leaving no stone unturned. The treatment would have been more perspicuous if, in preference to the step-by-step method adopted, passages from the texts had been printed in parallel columns, and the appertaining remarks grouped together in short paragraphs, instead of being presented singly, and in isolation. It would have been better still, if Ulrich's *Parzival* had first been made accessible as a whole. Dr Boyd promises us an edition of this in the near future. But surely it is a putting of the cart before the horse to publish, first, a commentary on the text, later, and in the second place, the text itself? This procedure, whatever precedents may be urged in its favour, cannot be recommended.

The final summing-up is hardly adequate: so detailed an analysis should have been followed by a synthesis of the results on broader lines, substantiating the preliminary survey on p. 2. The main fact, however, is abundantly proved: that Ulrich was a good compiler and imitator, who added nothing of his own to the material supplied by his sources. And this, as Dr Boyd points out in his introduction, can be turned to further account as a help to the reconstruction of the lost works *Merlin* and *Seyfrit*, which are known only through Ulrich's versions. Dr Boyd also shows that, of the three sources used for the *Parzival-Gawein* sections, Wolfram's *Parzival* takes precedence of the other two. 'It is noteworthy, that he (Ulrich) does not even admit any indebtedness to either Heinrich or Albrecht, large parts of whose writings he interpolated in his work. The explanation may lie in the fact that at the outset

he had no intention of going beyond Wolfram.' But is not the omission of any reference to Albrecht probably due to an assumption, on Ulrich's part, that *der jüngere Titurel* also was Wolfram's work?

Part I, chapter 2, entitled 'Interrelation of Ulrich's Sources', deals instead with the old problem: Crestien *versus* Kiot. This chapter might with advantage have been left out. The relation of Ulrich to Wolfram is, after all, not so much affected by the problem of Wolfram's source as to justify these five to six pages of slap-dash discussion. Dr Boyd seeks to disarm our criticism by saying in advance that he can neither 'claim to have any solution to offer, nor to have any argument to expound which is so convincing as to put the matter beyond all doubt'. With the latter part of the statement we heartily agree: no argument can be convincing which deliberately ignores any positive proofs to the contrary. Dr Boyd's own view is conveniently simple: 'Wolfram was, in my opinion, a reproducer and continuator of Crestien. As a reproducer he used the entire Crestien fragment—on the whole fairly closely and at times quite literally—for Books III–XIII; as a continuator he completed Crestien's story, adding the latter part of Book XIII, Books XIV–XVI, and the two introductory Books I and II, which relate the "Vorgeschichte" of the hero.' (The deviations of Book IX are passed over.)

Dr Boyd is welcome to his opinion, but he should be more careful to give a fair impression of the views on the opposite side. 'There are', he continues, 'two main objections to this theory, namely (a) the fact that Wolfram categorically states that Kiot, a Provençal poet, was his source, and (b) the improbability of a mediaeval poet such as Wolfram producing these Books independent of any source.'

I do not know what is meant by the expression *such as Wolfram*, since no student of Mediaeval German has ever questioned Wolfram's distinctive place among the poets of his age. And, in fact, that second objection has not been made by any great critic. It was no undervaluation of Wolfram's genius but the accumulative force of the data assembled by their researches, actuated no doubt by a legitimate wish to put Wolfram's own statement to the proof, which led Heinzel and Singer, and other workers in the same field of enquiry, to their conclusions. We need not accept the conclusions, but we must at least show respect for the methods by which they were reached, and some appreciation of the results gathered. There is no use in dismissing with a categorical 'I do not believe' the many points of contact between Wolfram's *Parzival* and other Grail-romances later than Crestien's. They are surely not all due to the long arm of coincidence. The time is ripe for the recognition that Wolfram's creative genius suffers no detraction if we admit an ability to draw material from Romance sources other than Crestien's work. It is no longer merely a question of Crestien *vel* Kiot. But Dr Boyd does not seem to have envisaged a third point of view.

Some inconsequence is shown in the spelling of Proper Names: *Arnif* and *Arrive*, *Ginnever* and *Ginover*, *Feirefiz* and *Feirafiz*, *Garvain* and *Garwein*; but this inconsequence is perhaps excused by the variations in the texts themselves. The shortening of the name *Repanse de Schoye* to

Repanse, which occurs somewhat often, is an innovation, however; and there is one bad misprint, *Kay*, twice repeated, for *Kyot*, on p. 153.

There are also numerous mistakes on points of detail. The phrase 'den thimonen richten' is ascribed to Hugo von Wolkenstein: is this name a cross between Hugo von Montfort and Oswald von Wolkenstein? Note 1, p. 3 is not quite accurate, for Martin does not actually *identify* Parzival with Fulk of Anjou, and the coat of arms referred to by Siegenfeld was Gahmuret's, not Parzival's. The 'hostie' brought by the dove on Good Friday is not, in Wolfram's account, placed *in* the stone but *on* it—*uf den stein*. Dr Boyd (p. 12, l. 25) has obviously in mind the account of Heinrich von dem Türlin; there is a similar confusion on p. 13, where the name *Angara* is transferred from Heinrich's relation to Crestien's, or so the form of the sentence implies. Again, on p. 24, last line: some apparent confusion between Wolfram and Albrecht. For the Grail sword, in Wolfram's account, is not given to Ekunat, it simply passes out of the story and is forgotten: there is no need to motivate its absence in the combat with Feirefiz. Parzival is Sigune's cousin, not her nephew, as stated on p. 36; nor is Katelangen ever referred to by Wolfram as the *Grail domains* (p. 16, l. 29); it is the country of Schoysiane's husband and need not be thought of as situated near Terre de Salvaesche. There is evident misreading of Wo.Parz. 737, 27: with regard to the combat between Parzival and Feirefiz Dr Boyd speaks of 'Wolfram's reference to the Grail as a means of protection to both heroes.' What Wolfram says is, however: 'ich sorge des den ich hân brâht, wan daz ich trôstes hân gedâht, in stûle des grâles kraft ernern'; clearly an allusion to Parzival only. The news of Secundille's death does not reach Feirefiz and Repanse de Schoye *on their arrival in the East* (p. 157) but before they set sail. According to Wolfram, at least; perhaps Ulrich differs. Lastly, and in contradiction of what has been correctly stated in the analysis, in the final summing-up we are told that *both* Parzival and Gawein 'are denounced in the presence of Arthur and his followers by Cundrie', and that Parzival fights by mistake *first* with Gramoflanz and *then* with Gawein. And also that Parzival's *second* meeting with Sigune takes place in the *hermit's cell*: is that the cell of Trevrizent?

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that Ulrich's 'meaningless story, in which Gawein cuts his hand with a knife' (p. 92) is probably based on Wo.Parz. 301, 8-12. Further, his 'gratuitous remark that the bed of the "Altherr" was set with stones and gold, and equalled in sumptuousness that of Tituel at the Grail' (why *at*?) may have been inspired by the detailed description of Anfortas' bed in Wo.Parz. Book XVI.

It is rather surprising to hear Cundrie spoken of (p. 150) as a 'young lady' (a literal translation of M.H.G. *juncfrouwe*); and the remark on p. 88 that 'it is doubtful whether a young girl conformed to the mediaeval conception of a worthy "bote" to King Arthur' is made in complete forgetfulness of a custom which, if rare in real life, was well known in Arthurian legend.

MARGARET F. RICHEY.

LONDON.

Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock. By PAUL HANKAMER. (*Epochen der deutschen Literatur.* Band II. Zweiter Teil.) Stuttgart. J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1935. viii + 543 pp R.M. 15.50.

Critics who complain that this volume is not a clear guide to students of German literature are at least premature in their demands. The task undertaken by Dr Hankamer was in many ways more problematic than that which confronted previous contributors to the series (with the exception of Wolfgang Stammeler), for the Baroque now more than ever implies discussion. The ecstasy of discovery in Cysarz' book of twelve years ago gave way to a mood of questioning (clearly expressed above all by Viëtor), and Dr Hankamer seems modestly aware that his answers are tentative.

Social considerations have influenced him throughout, even in the discussion of detailed linguistic form (p. 380). Advantages of this approach are obvious, particularly in the excellent sections devoted to the form of opera and novel. But in three directions the work suffers slightly through social bias. The over-complex geographical demarcation calls to mind the warning of one acknowledged by the author himself as a leader, Günther Müller: 'Die Geschichte ist amathematisch.' Secondly, the aesthetic of the stage is somewhat neglected—a matter for regret since the investigations of Flemming, and more recently of Eggert, have placed it within closer reach. And thirdly, the treatment of the theorists is by no means complete: we miss the names of Nikolaus Harres and of Erdmann Neumeister (whose *Specimen Dissertationis* and the disturbance it caused belong assuredly to this period). cursory discussion of Neukirch, Bohse and Hunold might be excused by Schneider's inclusion of them in his volume, but that Wendland's weighty dissertation of 1930 has provided material for new discussion under the rubric of the Baroque. A summary of the moral counterblast to the craving for *maraviglia* might be expected in a work which does so much to delineate the 'Lebensstil' of its epoch. (Dr Hankamer does indeed express the need for a treatment of the 'literarsoziologische Bedeutung der Geistlichkeit'; perhaps 'literarisch' would suffice for a time.) In formal discussion, especially on the matters of irony and allegory, and in its excursion into the field of music, the book gives balanced and valuable judgement.

Recent new assessments of values have been carefully adopted by Dr Hankamer, notably in the treatment of Grimmelshausen, Beer and Bidermann. On rare occasions he is unnecessarily brusque, as when he deprecates the efforts (presumably of Conr. Höfer and Flemming) towards the establishment of authorship of the Rudolstadt plays—'Stieler oder Johann Bleyer' (misprinted as Beyer!). Sometimes the results of very painstaking research are neglected, except for mention in the excellent and exhaustive bibliography prepared by Dr Pyritz. This becomes serious when the author avoids specific treatment of Wagenseil (compiler not only of the chronicles but also of the *Tela ignea Satanae*) and of Knorr von Rosenroth, whose influence even beyond Germany was considerable. This latter omission is the greater pity, since one can scarcely

think of a scholar better equipped to incorporate a treatment of Knorr's form of mysticism than Dr Hankamer himself.

A very useful part of the book, in spite of occasional vagueness of reference, is the alphabetical table of writers. Place of origin is followed generally (in brackets) by the region in which the author worked; sometimes for example (Hamburg) or (Königsberg) is indicated in keeping with the strict regional discussion in the text, sometimes, very widely, (Norddeutschland) or (Rheinland), where a more exact reference would have been logical and possible. The term 'Wirkenszeit' is useful but risky. (Surely, by the way, against the name of Heidenreich, 'ab 1652' is a misprint for 'ab 1662'—the date of the Corneille and Vondel translations.)

These points of criticism are, however, chiefly concerned with debatable differences of approach or with details; in neither effect nor intention can they assail the main merit of Dr Hankamer's book, which is a profound and enlightening interpretation of the thought and mode of a very complex era.

W. F. MAINLAND.

LONDON.

Die Verbürgerlichung der deutschen Kunst, Literatur und Musik im 18. Jahrhundert. By LEO BALET and E. GERHARD. Strassburg, Leipzig, Zürich: Heitz and Co.; Leiden: J. Ginsberg. 1936. 508 pp. 12 M. 50.

The purpose of this book is to show how, with the gradual growth in importance of the middle class, or rather the 'bourgeoisie', literature and all the arts underwent a transformation in eighteenth-century Germany. It is a study in the economic interpretation of history, with special reference to the arts. 'Politik', says the author, 'ist nichts anderes als die durch den Staat organisierte und realisierte Oekonomie' (p. 96). 'Aus allem vorher Gesagten folgt also, dass Moral immer Klassenmoral ist, und nur Klassenmoral sein kann, genau so wie Recht immer Klassenrecht ist' (p. 115). 'Die Wandlung der irdischen Anschauungen musste von selbst auch eine Wandlung der himmlischen Anschauungen hervorrufen' (p. 113). These quotations of highly debatable statements are perhaps enough to indicate what kind of an 'ideology' is behind the present work.

The author's method, he tells us, is dialectical. From an investigation of the 'Totalität des Geschehens' he has discovered a 'Synthese der Kunst- und Kulturerscheinungen', with the help of which a collaborator has been able to bring the history of music into the scheme. The thesis briefly is this. By 1750 the bourgeoisie in Germany had acquired unprecedented power in economic and cultural affairs, but they now found further progress hindered by the prevailing political system, absolutism. The second half of the century saw their struggle for economic and political freedom, and for a social status equal or even superior to that of the aristocracy. It is this struggle which is the real subject-matter of the literature of the period, and it is equally clearly reflected in all the other arts. In all we see the same hostility to absolutism and the same democratic tendency. The cultivation of 'Humanität', in this view, was a

subtle conscious attempt to undermine the social esteem paid to the aristocracy by insistence on the rights of men as men. It resulted in the extreme subjectivity of the bourgeois of this age and even led in many cases—the supreme example is Goethe—to the ‘Absolutisierung des bürgerlichen Ich’. ‘Goethe war so bürgerlich’, we are assured, ‘dass er vor lauter Bürgerlichkeit das Bürgerliche wieder negierte und unbürgerlich wurde.’ Finally the author tries to show that by the fullest development of intelligence, will and feeling, as well as by a ‘Bereinigung des Menschlichen’ through the cult of the natural, the bourgeois was aiming at proving his superiority to the aristocrat and his claim to the highest social consideration.

The thesis is worked out with a great wealth of detail in these 500 pages, but though much curious information is offered and some interesting suggestions are thrown out, the book cannot be said to bring unity, as it claims, into ‘die verwirrende Fülle von Einzelercheinungen, sowohl der feudalen ersten als der bürgerlichen zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts’. The notions ‘feudal’ and ‘bürgerlich’ are in the first place not sufficiently carefully analysed. It is the bourgeois capitalist in the Marxian sense who is made ultimately responsible for the change of style described, but it is more than doubtful whether he was a dominant type in the Germany of that period. To explain features of style, analogies between various phenomena of the age are suggested, in the manner of Spengler, but no causal connexion can usually be proved. Absolutism, for instance, is made responsible for ‘das gleichförmige, fast pausenlose, scheinbar unendliche Fortspinnen eines einmal gegebenen thematischen Materials’, in a fugue of Bach, let us say, because ‘endlose Bewegung’ symbolizes the idea of unbounded power. Surely no sociological study of the arts can be satisfactory which does not start from the extremely complex realities of the period under consideration, instead of from abstractions taken over from a ready-made philosophy of history, and which does not attempt to view both individuals and groups with an open mind, free of partisan spirit. The tone of this book is bitter and negative. It is characteristic that almost the only writer who gets a good mark is Wieland, because of what the author considers his sane attitude in matters of sex.

W. H. BRUFORD.

EDINBURGH.

Richard Beer-Hofmann. By S. LIPTZIN. New York: Bloch Publishing Co. 1936. 114 pp. \$1.50.

Professor Liptzin has followed up his recent book on Schnitzler with this slender monograph on one of the most significant of the group of writers which shed its brilliance on Austrian literature in the nineties, and included Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Arthur Schnitzler and Hermann Bahr. These three, whose fame was international, are dead. Beer-Hofmann, who recently celebrated his seventieth birthday, is hardly known outside Austria and has written comparatively little, but it is safe to say that his literary achievement, small in bulk as it is, will have

permanent importance. A tragedy, *Der Graf von Charolais*, inspired by Wolf, Graf von Baudissin's version of the seventeenth-century English play *The Fatal Dowry*; *Jaakobs Traum* and *Der junge David*, the prologue and first part respectively of an intended dramatic trilogy; a couple of short stories and a novel; a few poems—this is almost the sum of his creative writing, but much of it cannot be passed by when we come to estimate the lasting contribution of Austria to the literature of the German tongue. No one who has read his profoundly moving poem *Schlaflied für Mirjam* can fail to wish for further knowledge of a poet who can express in four stanzas of such brooding concentration the elemental feeling by which his soul is stirred.

Professor Liptzin emphasizes the Jewish spirit which inspires the works of Beer-Hofmann. But Beer-Hofmann is also essentially Austrian, and it is one of the major points of interest for the student of modern German literature that the spirit of Austria, or at any rate of Vienna, during the declining years of the Habsburg empire should have found its most significant expression in the work of writers whose blood is wholly or partly Jewish. Whether these writers have a particular sensitiveness or intuition that warns them of what is to come, or whether they are endowed to a more intense degree with the spirit of the times as manifested in the nation of which they form part, there is no doubt that they invest with an added importance the argument that the poet is the historian of his age.

Beer-Hofmann's conviction of a mysterious purposefulness in life, that each of us is bound by a link of fate with those who have gone before and those who will come afterwards, finds a parallel in many a line of Von Hofmannsthal but distinguishes him from Schnitzler. Unlike Schnitzler, with his sceptical aestheticism, Beer-Hofmann found a transition from the exotic refinement of feeling of the nineties to the austerity of Old Testament tradition. In 1933 his books were included in the auto-da-fé with which the students of the German universities celebrated the faith that was in them. The lonely poet holds aloof from the antagonisms of the day, but the unfinished trilogy at which he is still slowly working treats, in its Biblical setting, of problems that have not ceased to be actual and human conflicts that are symbolic and eternal.

WILLIAM ROSE.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

The twenty-first volume of *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, collected by Herbert Read (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1936. 168 pp. 7s. 6d.), provides, like the preceding volumes, excellent and varied fare. In 'The Problem of the Scottish Poet' Sir Herbert Grierson discusses, as he alone can, the use of Scots and English by Scottish writers from the fifteenth century onwards. Mr T. S. Eliot in an interesting 'Note on the Verse of John Milton' argues that Milton's strength was in his aural rather than his visual imagination, and that in some ways his influence on later poets was necessarily harmful. M. J. Delcourt, in 'Some Aspects of Sir Thomas More's English', revises in the light of recent investigation some chapters of his well-known *Essai*. Mr Hugh Macdonald examines 'The Attacks on John Dryden' and sees what can be learnt from them of his character; Mr A. Watkin-Jones exposes the errors of 'Langbaine's Account of the English Dramatic Poets' and the ill-effects of its vogue; Mr J. Isaacs discusses 'Coleridge's Critical Terminology'; Mr W. H. Gardner writes of G. M. Hopkins' *Wreck of the Deutschland*. Finally, in 'An Open Letter to Dr Tillyard', Mr C. S. Lewis takes up again the question of the Personal Heresy, clearing away some misconceptions and re-asserting his main position.

H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS.

Messrs Methuen have made an excellent start with the Studies Section of their Old English Library by the publication of Mr Ritchie Girvan's book on *Beowulf and the Seventh Century* (London: Methuen. 1935. viii+86 pp. 3s. 6d.). The book consists of lectures on the Language, the Background, and on Folk Tale and History in the poem, delivered in the University of London. Mr Girvan suggests that the poem was written in the seventh century in Northumbria and he shows how the conditions pictured in it would fit such a hypothesis. The pagan ceremonies and customs described in the poem are shown to have been purely antiquarian and could have had no living reality at the time of composition. Moreover the conditions, material and moral, to be found in *Beowulf* reflect the conditions in Northumbria in the seventh century. The value of the poem as evidence for the history of the Danes and Geats is examined and interesting suggestions made to account for the result of such an examination. In a discussion on the historicity of *Beowulf* himself some notable analogues are produced from medieval romance for those who would deny that historicity merely because of the deeds of the hero. Most of Mr Girvan's arguments depend, as he himself points out, on the hypothesis that the poem was written during the seventh century. On the evidence which he brings forward this seems probable enough and on such a question probability is all that we can reasonably expect. This is certainly a book which no student of *Beowulf* can afford to omit from his reading—a book, too, in which students of Old English history will find much that is valuable and suggestive.

R. M. WILSON.

Dr Fransson's book (*Middle English Surnames of Occupation*, 1100–1350, *Lund Studies in English*, III. Lund, 1935. 217 pp. 10 kr.) is a valuable contribution to the study of a subject on which little work has, as yet, been done. The medieval material is used, to a certain extent, by Bardsley and, much more fully, in Professor Weekley's valuable books. But Dr Fransson is the first scholar to attempt a complete survey of that material and his book should prove most valuable, not only to the linguist but also to the economic historian. For the linguist the medieval forms will be at least as valuable as the Middle English forms of place-names for the study of the dialects. The fact that over 250 of the surnames dealt with are not recorded in the *New English Dictionary* and that the first instances given of many of the others are earlier, in some cases considerably earlier, than the *New English Dictionary's* first quotation for the word, is some indication of the value of the book. The material, too, throws considerable light on the question of dialectal vocabulary, a point on which little work has been done and on which our knowledge, for the medieval period at any rate, is decidedly vague. To the economic historian it will be found that the book adds considerably to our knowledge of medieval trade and industry. It is fortunate that such an important and unjustifiably neglected subject should have attracted the attention of so capable a scholar as Dr Fransson. His cautious scholarship is exemplary and dissent from his conclusions is rarely possible. He evidently knows his material well and presents it in a methodical and lucid form. Only exceptionally does the English in which the book is written bear witness to the hand of a foreign, rather than a native, writer. In addition to the main subject, as indicated by the title, the book also contains an interesting introduction on the origin and development of Middle English surnames, useful notes on two suffixes of obscure history—the endings *-ester* and *-ier*—and an excursus on toponymical surnames. Two limitations have been found necessary by the author in his survey of the subject. The surnames of occupation with which he deals are confined to those of artisans and dealers, no doubt the most interesting part of the subject, and the material is taken mainly from ten counties only, though these ten counties give a fair representation of the different Middle English dialects. It is to be hoped that, at some later date, Dr Fransson himself will be able to deal with the material unavoidably omitted here and to give us a complete survey of Middle English surnames.

R. M. WILSON.

Two Centuries of Spenserian Scholarship (1609–1805) (by Jewel Wurtsbaugh. viii + 174 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1936) supplies a chronological record of textual, critical and biographical studies upon Spenser during the period specified. Readers of F. I. Carpenter's *Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser* may well feel that this excellent compilation leaves little scope for more books about books on Spenser, even in the form of doctorate dissertations, and Miss Wurtsbaugh's summary is not likely to modify that impression. Her own misgivings are evident from her conclusion; if she herself can wish that 'her

tedious travell' had been more often interrupted 'with such sweet variety as may be discovered at all times in the poet's own delightful land of Faery' she can hardly expect greater enthusiasm from her reader. A compendium of Spenserian research that resolves itself into a series of excerpts from early biographers and of summaries from Hughes, Warton and other Spenserians is not 'in miniature a history of scholarship at large', which would demand far more in the way of classification and criticism. The book serves its purpose as a survey and no more. The section on early texts may prove useful to editors, though here something should have been said of the problems centring on the reissues of *Mother Hubbard's Tale* and the revisions to *The Ruins of Time*. The most satisfactory chapter is that devoted to Todd's Variorum Edition.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

In his lecture upon *The Meaning of The Tempest* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Literary and Philosophical Society. 1936. 23 pp. 1s.) Professor Dover Wilson adds two confident conjectures to the biography of Shakespeare. First, that Shakespeare himself acted the part of Prospero at a performance at Court in 1611, for which the epilogue was written. Second, that Shakespeare's retirement was thus announced from the stage to the assembled Court by himself, and that he ceased to be a member of the King's Company thereafter. I take this to mean that he sold his share in the Company in 1611. One may well ask what Shakespeare was doing, if this were so, writing parts of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII*, some years later (Professor Wilson's own account of his activities). And there is some inconsistency in the rival suggestions that he 'was tempted back from Stratford' (p. 3), and that he wrote thereafter only at Stratford (p. 6), the latter surely a difficult way of collaborating in London plays. Both these pieces of conjectural biography seem to me to be very dubious. It is going too far to assume that 'he is known to have left London and the theatre for Stratford in 1611 or thereabouts' (p. 5). This is not knowledge; it is conjecture.

For the rest, Professor Wilson tackles Lytton Strachey's treatment of the 'Romances', some part of which, however, he admits into his present interpretation of *The Tempest*, and in expounding the 'Mood of Peace' in which it was written he arrives at something much nearer the probable truth than the time-honoured waxwork effigy of the benign Olympian. There is, as ever in Professor Wilson, much of that appreciative insight that comes of unflinching zest, in this critical return to one of Shakespeare's loveliest plays.

C. J. SISSON.

In *Bibliographies of Twelve Victorian Authors* (Compiled by T. G. Ehrsam and R. H. Dely, under the direction of R. M. Smith. New York: H. W. Wilson. 1936. 362 pp. \$4), the authors included are Matthew Arnold, E. B. Browning, Clough, Fitzgerald, Hardy, Kipling, William Morris, the Rossettis, Stevenson, Swinburne and Tennyson. The lists are divided in each case into three parts, a bare chronological outline of the author's life, a list of existing bibliographies, including those to be found in

standard editions of the author's works or in books about him, and a list of critical and biographical material, including books and articles, with reviews listed under individual works, which appear under the author's name in this third list. The bibliographies are therefore not complete author bibliographies, but are intended as guides to the material available for research. No annotations are provided, nor is there any distinction between material of greater or less importance, though the compilers say that they have omitted trivial references.

The lists seem to have been put together with the painstaking industry that we have learned to expect in the H. W. Wilson publications. A careful check of several parts of the book has failed to reveal any important omissions, though references might have been given to Schuster and Wieser's *Weltliteratur der Gegenwart*, in which several pages are given to Hardy and Kipling. Dissertations, as well as published work, are included, but when dissertations have been published the compilers might usefully have given a reference to the publisher, as in the case of Hyder's *Swinburne's literary career and fame*, entered as a dissertation of Harvard University, though published by the Duke University and Cambridge University Presses in 1933.

J. D. COWLEY.

The Dictionary to the *Plays and Novels of Bernard Shaw* of L. and V. M. Broad has been followed up after seven years by an analogous work, compiled in German, by an Alsatian, and published in France. In conformity with the usual policy of M. Xavier Heydet, his *Shaw-Kompendium* (Paris: Didier. 1936. 228 pp. 25 fr.) makes no pretence at offering the author's own opinion, which, in view of the long years he has devoted to the subject and the contacts he has established, would be a notable addition. The lists of facts about Shaw's life, dates of publication and performance of his works in England and Germany, the selection of monographs in English and German: all these things add very little to what the English bibliography had given us. Of greater interest is the series of criticisms from newspapers and reviews. Although the importance attributed to minor works is occasionally exaggerated, the accounts as a whole are so representative that they enable the reader to form a fair judgement of the effect Shaw has produced on German mentality. Where no German article has been available, M. Heydet has had recourse to English sources (e.g. Sir Sidney Low on the Harris biography), has himself supplied the deficiency or taken an extract from a work on Shaw.

The most interesting section for the general reader is undoubtedly the long extract from a lecture by Trebitsch, the Viennese translator of Shaw, who met the dramatist through the intermediary of William Archer, and who gives a charmingly modest account of his early relations with Shaw and his beginnings as a translator. He also traces the fortunes of Shaw in Germany, with special reference to the Reinhardt production of *Candida*.

This work, well set-out and well printed, envisages primarily the needs of English seminars and University libraries abroad; it will be of extreme

value as a starting point to any student of comparative literature interested in Germany's reactions to Shaw, since the extremely difficult task of tracing the main documents in periodicals and the great dailies has been very adequately done, though one would welcome some reference to the numerous articles which have appeared in the *Englische Studien*.

MINA J. MOORE.

The Survival of French in the Old District of Sainte Genevieve, by W. A. Dorrance (*University of Missouri Studies*. 1935. 133 pp. \$1.25) contains an historical sketch of what remains of these Canadian French communities, who emigrated to Missouri in the early eighteenth century, an account of their language in some fifty pages, and some thirty pages devoted to their folklore and songs. The work is written in a sprightly style and makes pleasant reading. Unfortunately, the author has not the philological equipment necessary to bring the book up to the standard now expected in research of this kind. It is not customary nowadays to speak of an acute accent or a tréma being 'retained throughout the whole conjugation' of a verb, when what is meant is that a close *e* or a hiatus is heard in all the verb forms. Nor should he quote with approval the statement that Canadian French is a 'mixture of French, Western and Central Dialects, grafted on to Old French'. A little more training in linguistics would have made the author discard such etymologies as *bacul* from *baculus* or *cenelle* from *sener* (a Poitevin form of *semer*). A little more knowledge of Old French would have saved him from classing *a* as a preposition 'used for *ce*' in *a matin*, *a souere* (cf. O.F. *arruit*). A little more knowledge of Modern French would have improved his treatment of *bâtisse*, *cançon*, *il fera chaud*, *espérer*, *gnangnan*, *se grouiller*, *rendu*, *trion*, etc., and use of the Linguistic Atlas would have helped him with a number of words, e.g. *moine* for *toupie*, *dalle* for *gouttière*, and *béquille* for *échasse*. Despite this rather amateurish handling of his material, and despite all lack of systematic rendering of the sounds of the dialect, the author has collected some very acceptable material, showing us incidentally (and unintentionally) that the historians of French could with profit make more use of the archaic material which the relictia in these ancient settlements provide.

J. ORR.

The Influence of l'orthographe sur la prononciation du français moderne, by Vladimir Buben (*Travaux de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université Komenský à Bratislava*, No. XIX. Bratislava. 1935. 244 pp. Cena Kč. 60) suffers somewhat by being at once both a thesis and a guide to the vagaries of modern French pronunciation. On the scientific side, it still leaves a good deal to be said on a very important theme. For example, the whole question of the therapeutic use of spelling features in pronunciation to avoid homonymic clashes (*séant*, to avoid [sã], *péril* and *périr*, to avoid [pri], etc.), together with their semantic and morphological uses (*plus* pronounced [plys] and [ply], *tous* [tus], to distinguish it from *tout*, etc.), though touched upon here and there, still calls for systematic and thorough treatment. Yet, by concentrating so much on

the practical side, the author has written one of the most useful books on French pronunciation that any foreigner has written since Nyrop. Not that much of what he gives us is the result of direct observation. But he has examined a great number of works by French and foreign phoneticians and shows how conflicting and fluctuating are their pronouncements, and proves his point that much of this fluctuation is due to the influence of the very defective system of orthography with which French has been afflicted since the late Middle Ages. He further gives very useful information upon the pronunciation of a host of words, including place-names, which embarrass both foreigner and native—words, for example, where *ll*, *gn*, *ch*, *qu*, *gu* occur—and it is a pity that this usefulness was not further increased by the providing of a *complete* index. The results of his enquiry have linguistic implications which it is impossible to discuss briefly, as they have a bearing on the whole question of sound development. I have noticed very few inaccuracies with regard to details of pronunciation, though it is scarcely true to say, for example, that *en* never loses its nasalization. Again, more might have been made of the tendency, in more youthful speakers, to avoid the 'broad' sounds in words like *château*, *gâteau*, etc., and the closed *o* of *rôtir*, *côté*, etc., despite the orthography: a social, not a physiological sound change, in process of accomplishment. A good book to place upon the shelves of a departmental library.

J. ORR.

Wasser- und Weingefässe im heutigen Italien, by Paul Scheuermeier (Bern: Francke. 1934. 61 pp. with 3 maps and 37 photographs. Fr. 6.80), displays cartographically on an ethnographical basis, as has been indicated in a recent review in these pages (*v. M.L.R.*, April, 1936, pp. 236–7), the material of maps 965–9 of *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz* (K. Jaberg und J. Jud), Bd. v, 1933. It describes and represents pictorially the various kinds of vessels for wine and water in daily use in present-day Italy and Southern Switzerland. The significance of the little work lies not only in its revelation of the life of the people and their artistic instincts, but also in its historical suggestiveness. The copper pitchers, carried on the head to the wells in patriarchal fashion, the thick clay bowls with differing handles and spouts, the various wood, leather and glass receptacles, reflect a whole world of objects and ways of life, of ancient customs and of workmanship in pottery and metal. The names of the vessels give occasion from time to time to observations of etymological interest. There are three maps, which demonstrate, as the review previously mentioned points out, the identity of the great linguistic zones with the ancient cultural zones of Italy. The photographs in the appendix, as well as the numerous woodcuts scattered throughout the pages, add realism to a work which will be appreciated by those sensitive to the charm and the historic background of the popular life in the regions dealt with.

F. C. JOHNSON.

Donoso Cortés, like his master Joseph de Maistre, is once more to the fore and Dr Edmund Schramm's study of his activities (*Donoso Cortés*:

Leben und Werk eines Spanischen Antiliberalen. 1935. Hamburg: Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut. 155 pp. 4 M. 50) is topical as well as being a careful contribution (the first detailed account of any length) to the scholarship of the subject. The first chapter attempts to summarize the involved political movements of the early years of the nineteenth century, the development of liberalism in its various layers, and the influence of the Revolution. The result is somewhat confused. Some account is necessary, however, to appreciate Cortés's own evolution. We are given in some detail his life as a journalist and political thinker showing from an early date signs of his later conversion. Chapter v examines the speeches of 1849, and analyses closely the theological ideas on which his change of politics depended, the remarks on the opening of the letter to Montalembert being of particular interest. Later chapters deal with Donoso Cortés in the embassies of Berlin and Paris and at considerable length with the *Ensayo* of 1851. There is a very full bibliography including articles and essays.

E. SARMIENTO.

No systematic account of the influence of the Christian Church on the German language has yet been written—R. von Raumer's book (1845) is now out of date—and none can be written until much more preliminary work has been done. In his sketch of the subject (*Die altdeutsche Kirchensprache*. St Gallen: Karl Weiss. 1936) Dr Emil Luginbühl deals with a part of what German owes to the Church, and shows the method which should be adopted in dealing with the subject as a whole. Such a work must discover the place of origin of words and the paths they have followed in spreading over the country, the influence of other languages in providing models for the formation of German words or in making German formations unnecessary. The author deals with German to A.D. 1000, and uses 'altdeutsch' instead of 'althochdeutsch' because all German dialects have to be considered.

The influence of Gothic and of Old English on German is treated in some detail. The following words are especially investigated: *Kirche*, *Samstag*, *glauben*, *Gott*, *Heiland*, *Geist*, *heilig*, *taufen*, *barmherzig*, *demütig*, *Trost*, and *Gnade*. A special section is devoted to the influence of the diocese of Cologne. The last section of the book deals with Notker's method of translation by taking as examples: *saeculum*, *confiteri*, *psalmus*, *sacramentum*, *benedicere*, and *magnificentia*. The little book is very interesting.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

Mr A. T. Hatto is the first Englishman to contribute to the publications of Professor Vollmer's *Deutsches Bibel-Archiv in Hamburg*; he has edited for this institution for the first time a German manuscript from the British Museum, *Eine Deutsche Apokalypse des 14. Jahrhunderts*, which forms a part of the sixth volume of *Bibel und deutsche Kultur (Neue Texte zur Bibelerdeutschung des Mittelalters)*. Herausgegeben von Hans Vollmer. Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion. 1936. viii + 270 pp. RM. 24).

In his introduction Mr Hatto gives a short history and description of the manuscript, which he dates 1350-70, and shows the relation of his London manuscript to two other MSS., viz. Augsburg 148 and Meiningen 57. The text is followed by notes which give all the variant readings from the other MSS. and readings from the Vulgate in so far as these throw light on the text. Mr Hatto proposes to deal with various problems arising from his text in more detail in a periodical. His edition reaches the high standard of merit which we are accustomed to expect in Professor Vollmer's publications.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

The author of this condensed little treatise, *Beiträge zum Deutschen Volksliedstil um 1500*, by Heinrich Kirschner (*Deutsche Arbeiten der Universität Köln*, No. 8. Jena: Diederichs Verlag. 66 pp. 3 M. 60), emanating from the school of Friedrich von der Leyen, attempts to penetrate to the heart of his subject along four lines of approach: (1) A comparison of the *Volkslied* and *Kunstlied* where they treat cognate themes, with special reference to the *Tagelied*, the *geistliches Lied*, the *Martinshied*. (2) A division of the *Volkslied* into *epische, reflektierende, lyrisch-reflektierende, lyrische, episch-lyrische Lieder*, noting the peculiar features of style, diction, form in each category. (3) An examination of the disintegrating effect of music on the texts during the sixteenth century. (4) A further division under the rubrics *realistisches, humoristisches, phantastisches, idyllisches, heroisches Lied*.

The essential distinction between the folk-song of continuous tradition, such as the *Jägerlied*, and a more ephemeral species, such as the *Landsknechtslied*, is not touched upon. A happy choice of illustrative examples often leads to interesting results, notably the comparison of the mystic song: *Die so wellen Minne* (p. 10) with the popular *Marienhied: Und unser lieben frawen* (p. 12). However, the love of schematization seems at times to warp the author's judgement, as when he blames a spirited *Landsknechtslied* (p. 22) for its lack of 'logischem Grundriss und klargestichtetem Aufbau', because he classes it as a *reflektierendes Lied* and judges it only from that angle. This tendency culminates in a truly formidable tabularization of results on p. 62, which the author does not, however, wish us to accept as the sole aim of his analysis. He hopes for 'ein Fruchtbarmachen des spätmittelalterlichen Volkslieds' at least for the youth of Germany 'in volkloser Zeit'. Numerous gems of German folk-song, culled from hitherto unpublished sources and sympathetically interpreted (see *Fünf Söhne*, p. 59), certainly prove once again the innate vitality of the sixteenth-century *Volkslied*.

W. E. DELP.

Dr A. W. Holzmann, in his clear and careful study of *Family Relationships in the Dramas of August von Kotzebue* (Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. viii+183 pp. 9s.), discusses the following categories of characters in Kotzebue's plays: lovers, parents, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, and more distant relationships, such as grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins. The plays under consideration are chiefly comedies or sentimental

dramas, and the characters fall roughly into two groups, those which oppose and those which further the desired end, which is the union of the lovers. The characterization in the plays is compared with Kotzebue's own experience of family life. Many of the characters, however, do not have significance beyond providing a laughable scene.

There are certain difficulties inherent in this scheme. Some repetition is inevitable, and as references to plays are usually accompanied by a sketch of the intrigue, the significance of the facts brought to his notice is apt to elude the reader.

The author puts forward a defence of the morality of Kotzebue and his work, and shows that much of the hostile criticism directed at him during his life and after his death was unfair. He points out that the dramatist deserves credit for his sensitiveness to the will of his audience. A consideration of Kotzebue's plays as a record of contemporary life and thought is complicated, however, by the extent to which he borrowed from other authors and from the common stock of comedy.

BETSY AIKIN-SNEATH.

The eighth volume of *Nordiska texter och undersökningar* (Stockholm: Hugo Gebers Förlag; Copenhagen: Levin og Munksgaard. 1936. 185 pp. Kr. 7.20) is devoted to *Västsvenska Ordstudier* by fil. lic. Erik Abrahamson. It consists of an exhaustive study of a number of Swedish dialect words occurring in the central and southern parts of the coastal province of Bohuslän and in the Västragothian hundreds along the banks of the Göta älv. The following are the words examined, with their English meanings: **bottnunge*, **bottning*, 'ground current'; **brassmark*, 'wild, uncultivated country'; **brimbagge*, 'dor beetle'; *burgången*, 'canny, knowing'; **glymster*, (1) 'ravine', (2) 'pile of stones', (3) 'crevice' (in a rock); **hott*, **hotte*, 'inhabitant of Northern Bohuslän'; **hympe*, 'rear entrance to a fish-trap'; **kils*, 'short log'; **kräppoge*, 'narrow crevice in a rock'; **kväpp*, (1) 'wet or loosely rooted fir or pine', (2) 'looseness or damp in conifers'; **lökot*, 'wild, unrestrained'; *löt*, 'channel, course'; *majgräs*, 'meadow-sweet' (*Spiraea ulmaria*); **mjör* s., 'pile of stones', adj., 'crumbly, brittle, crisp'; *myra*, 'to caulk with sawdust'; **nödvatten*, 'water percolating through the seams of a sluice-gate'; **pese*, 'inhabitant of Västergötland'; *sova*, **rypa*, 'to doze in the twilight, blind man's holiday'; **skarpenord*, 'a kind of scythe'; **vassbårare*, **vassbåra*, 'purple sandpiper' (*Tringa maritima*); *ven*, **vena*, 'boil on hides of cattle, caused by eggs of the gadfly' (here, perhaps, Engl. *wen* might be adduced); **vresare*, 'whirlwind'; **vrik*, 'creek, corner'; **vrek*, 'corner'; (*ärl*), **ärl*, (1) 'subsoil', (2) 'hard crusted earth', (3) 'eminence, bank', (4) 'floor of an oven'. Under each word appears a list of the parishes in which it occurs, followed by a specimen passage in the dialect to illustrate its usage. This is recorded in the phonetic notation of the Swedish *landsmålsarkiv*, which contains a sufficiently large number of symbols to represent the wide variety of sounds heard. Then follows a detailed account of the derivation of each word, with illustrative quotations from other Germanic languages. At the end is a complete glossary

of all the Swedish dialect forms quoted, together with cognates in the other Scandinavian languages, German, Dutch, Frisian and English. In his preface Abrahamson states that his study is based on his own material and that he has collected 250,000 examples, many of them taken down from the speech of the local inhabitants. He is to be congratulated on the completion of an exceedingly laborious and scholarly piece of work.

R. J. McCLEAN.

Dr L. L. Hammerich, already known as the collaborator with Else Møller in a work on the Phonetics of Modern German published in 1934, provides in his *Kortfattet Tysk Lydhistorie* (Copenhagen, 1935) an admirably compact and trustworthy summary of the history of German sounds from the earliest times. His treatise has been compiled from notes taken at lectures by a student, Miss Eli Fischer-Jørgensen, and supplemented by the author's own lecture notes and subsequent revisions. The work falls naturally into four parts, viz. the development from Indo-European to Germanic, Germanic to West Germanic, West Germanic to Middle High German and Middle High German to Modern High German. The treatment is clear and systematic and illustrative rather than discursive. It is but natural that at some points statements might be amplified and in particular such works as Kiecker's *Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik* could be laid under contribution for many extra forms, e.g. O.H.G. *hreini* (I.E. \sqrt{grei} in § 7), O.H.G. *wal* (I.E. $k^w\text{hal}$ in § 17). On p. 18 the author omits mention of the following particle compounds: O.E. *geatwe* 'armour', *biot* < **bi-hait*, *fracud*. He holds that particle-compounded nouns were originally stressed on the root syllable and only later on the particle. His treatment of 'Auslautvokale' is rather too brief to help the student puzzled by the declensional and conjugational endings of Gothic and Old High German in their relation to other I.E. languages. In § 118 interesting parallels to the treatment of the short vowel in open syllables are given from the Scandinavian languages. In § 126 æ > [e:] e.g. *bequem* etc. is more specifically a Middle German phenomenon. Perhaps the date of Austrian diphthongization should be placed earlier than the thirteenth century in consideration of the rhyme *wines*: *deheines* in 'Daz Himelrich'. In the development of Modern German phonology a reference to the predilection for *a* in the unstressed syllable in *Nachbar*, *Kretscham*, *Monat*, *Bisam*, *Bräutigam* would have been welcome. The somewhat obscure development of *dw/tw* > *zw* (*zwerch*, *Zwerg*) in § 172 is merely adduced, but no explanation is offered. Such small points, however, in no way detract from the practical utility of this work for the preparation of University classes even far beyond the confines of Denmark.

W. E. COLLINSON.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

October—December 1936

With the collaboration of MARY S. SERJEANTSON (English),
A. T. HATTO and F. NORMAN (German)

GENERAL

- Arthuriana, Arthurian Bibliography, II: 1930-35. New York, Modern Language Association \$1.
- [Ballads] Norwegian Emigrant Songs and Ballads, ed. T. C. Blegen and M. R. Rund. Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s. 6d.
- BILLOUX, R., Chronologie des Arts graphiques. Paris, Bulletin Officiel des Maîtres Imprimeurs. 85 fr.
- BOE, J. et A. NUMMEDAL, Le Finnmarken. Les origines de la civilisation dans l'Extrême-Nord de l'Europe. Paris, Belles Lettres. 100 fr.
- CAILLOIS, Procès intellectuel de l'Art. Paris, Cahiers du Sud. 7 fr. 50.
- CALMETTE, J., Atlas Historique, II: Le Moyen Âge. Paris, Presses Universitaires. 30 fr.
- CARRÉ, J. R., Spinoza. Paris, Boivin. 6 fr.
- CLEUGH, J., Prelude to Parnassus. Scenes from the life of Pushkin. London, Barker. 10s. 6d.
- Congrès de Linguistes, Études dédiées au quatrième congrès de linguistes (Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, 6). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 9 M.
- DAMIANI, E., Sulla questione della trascrizione dei caratteri cirillici in caratteri latini e viceversa. Sofia, Cipev. n.p.
- Encyclopedia, Enciclopedia Italiana, XXIX-XXX: Reh-Scap. Rome, Istituto della Enciclopedia.
- EPPELSHEIMER, H. W., Handbuch der Weltliteratur, 4 ['Aufklärung' in Germany and Italy; Romanticism in Germany, Scandinavia and England]. Frankfurt, Klostermann. 4 M.
- GÉROULD, T., Histoire de la musique des origines à la fin du XIV^e siècle. Paris, Laurens. 50 fr.
- HANKISS, G., Storia della letteratura ungherese, It. trsl. F. Faber. Turin, Paravia. L. 18.
- HESSEN's Irish Lexicon, ed. by S. Caonhánach, R. Hertz, V. E. Hull and G. Lehmacher. Vol. 2, Fasc. 1. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.
- KALEVALA, Nordische Rundschau, 8, 3 (Kalevala-Gedenkheft).
- KREJČI, K., Polská Literatura ve vřech revoluce. Prague, Orbis.
- MEILLET, PICHON, BLOCH, DAUZAT, Conférences de l'Institut de Linguistique, III. Paris, Boivin. 6 fr.
- MÜLLER, G. (ed.), Jahrbuch d. Görres-Ges. Freiburg, Herder. 8 M.
- PIRENNE, H., Histoire de l'Europe des invasions au XVI^e siècle. Paris, Alcan. 50 fr.
- SAINTYVES, P., Manuel de Folklore. Paris, Nourry. 30 fr.
- SUTCLIFFE, E. F., A Grammar of the Maltese Language. Oxford Univ. Press. 6s.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- CARSTENSEN, R., *Die Interjektionen im Romanischen*. Diss. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.
- GOTTSCHALK, W., *Die bildhaften Sprichwörter der Romanen*, II: *Der Mensch im Sprichwort der romanischen Völker*. Heidelberg, Winter. 9 M. 80.
- NICHOLSON, G. G., *Un nouveau principe d'étymologie romane*. Paris, Droz. n.p.

Mediaeval Latin.

- ERASMUS, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, trsl. L. K. Born. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.
- LOFSTEDT, E., *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Paris, Droz. 80 fr.
- MANCINI, D., *The Usurpation of Richard the Third (De Occupatione Regni Anglie)*, ed. trsl. C. A. J. Armstrong. Oxford Univ. Press. 10s.
- OROSIUS, *Seven Books against the Pagans*, ed. I. W. Raymond. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.
- PEGHAIRE, J., *Intellectus et Ratio selon Saint Thomas Aquin (Institut d'Études médiévales d'Ottawa)*. Paris, Vrin. 32 fr.
- Pervigilium Veneris*, ed. Sir C. Clementi. Oxford, Blackwell. 7s. 6d.
- PSEUDO-TURPIN, *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi*, ed. C. M. Jones. Paris. 50 fr.
- RICHARD OF BURY, *El Philobiblion*, trsl. P. Tomás Viñas. Barcelona, Porter. 15 ptas.
- ROSE, H. J., *A Handbook of Latin Literature from the earliest times to the death of St Augustine*. London, Methuen. 21s.
- WILLIAM OF OCCAM? *Tractatus de principiis theologiae*, ed. L. Baudry. Paris, Vrin. 30 fr.

Italian.

- CARDUCCI, G., *La Cultura Estense e la gioventù dell' Ariosto (Ediz. Naz. XIII)*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 18.
- D'AMBRA, L., *L'Autore delle duecento commedie (Carlo Goldoni)*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 12.
- DANTE, *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, 18. Weimar, Bohlau.
- DANTE, *La Divine Comédie, paraphrase versifiée par L. A. Demelin*. Paris, Les Œuvres Françaises. 30 fr.
- GOLDONI, C., *Tutte le opere*, II, ed. G. Ortolani. L. 45.
- GORDON, L. H., *Supplementary Concordance to the Minor Italian Works of Dante*. (Dante Soc., Cambridge, Mass.) Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 8s. 6d.
- I Lirici del seicento e dell' Arcadia*, ed. C. Calcaterra. Milan, Rizzoli. L. 40.
- MOMIGLIANO, A., *Storia della letteratura italiana*. Messina, Principato. L. 20.
- MONTANARI, F., *Introduzione alla critica letteraria*. Rome, Studium. L. 4.
- NICASTRO, L., *Itinerari critici*. Milan, Hoepli. L. 15.
- ORSINI, N., *Bacone e Machiavelli*. Genoa, E. degli Orfini. L. 15.
- PANSINI, G., *Leopardi a Pisa, e altri saggi*. Pisa, Vallerina. L. 3.
- PELLICO, S., *Le mie prigioni, con XII capitoli aggiunti secondo il testo autentico*, ed. P. Leonetti. Naples, Morano. L. 10.
- PREVITERA, C., *La poesia e l' arte di Torquato Tasso*. Messina, Principato. L. 25.
- SEMPRINI, G., *La Filosofia di Pico della Mirandola*. Milan, Lib. Lombarda. L. 16.
- SOLITTO, G., *Ippolito Nievo*. Padua, Tip. del Seminario. L. 12.
- WEISS, C., *Laure et Pétrarque*. Paris, Dorbon-aîné. 18 fr.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- BABBITT, T., *La Crónica de Veinte Reyes*. (Yale Romanic St. XIII.) Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.
- BONE, MUIRHEAD and GERTRUDE BONE, *Old Spain*, 2 vols. London, Macmillan. £105.
- CAPADOSE, A. E., *Noble Families among the Sephardic Jews, with some account of the Capadose family*. Oxford Univ. Press. 42s.
- DIETRICH, A., *Phonizische Ortsnamen in Spanien* (Abh. f. d. Kunde des Morgenlandes, 21, 2). Leipzig, Dt. Morgenland Gesellschaft. 1 M. 50.
- FARINELLI, A., *Guillaume de Humboldt et l'Espagne; Goethe et l'Espagne*. Paris, Alcan. 30 fr.
- HILDBURG, W. L., *Medieval Spanish Enamels*. Oxford Univ. Press. 16s.
- JOUVENEL, R. DE, *Panorama de l'Amérique latine*. Paris, Éd. Sociales Internationales. 10 fr.
- LHANDÉ, P., *Le Moulin d'Hernani, récits de Navarre et du Pays-Basque*. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- Miscel·lània Lul·liana. Barcelona, Porter. 20 ptas.
- MOLLER, W., *Die christliche Banditen-Comedia (Ibero-Amerikanische Studien, 8)*. 3 M.
- SIEBERER, A., *Katalonien gegen Kastilien*. Vienna, Saturn. 6 M.
- TIEMANN, H., *Das spanische Schrifttum in Deutschland von der Renaissance bis zur Romantik (Ibero-Amerik. Studien, 6)*. Hamburg, Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut. 6 M. 50.

Portuguese.

- REYNOLDS, G. DE, *Portugal*. Paris, Spes. 18 fr.

Rumanian.

- GAMILLSCHEG, E., *Die Mundart von Șerbenești-Titulțești* (Berliner Beiträge, vi, 1-2). Jena, Gronau. 15 M.

French, Provençal.*(a) General (Including Linguistic).*

- BARENTON, H. DE, *L'Origine des langues, des religions et des peuples*, II, 2 Paris, Maisonneuve. 80 fr.
- BERCHTOLDT, H., *Der französische Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes*. Diss. Erlangen, Junge.
- BRØNDAL, V., *Le Français, langue abstraite*. Copenhagen, Levin and Munksgaard. 3 kr.
- BRUNOT, F., et C. BRUNEAU, *Précis de Grammaire Historique de la Langue Française*, nouv. éd. revue et corrigée. Paris, Masson. 50 fr.
- DAMOURETTE et PICHON, *Essai de Grammaire de la langue française*. Paris, d'Arthey. 150 fr.
- GAUTHIER-LUTY, P. et M. VINCENT, *31 Chansons populaires dauphinoises*. Grenoble, Didier et Richard. 6 fr.
- GEBHART, *D'Ulysse à Panurge*. Paris, Hachette. 7 fr. 50.
- [Genealogies] *Quelques Généalogies Annotées*, ed. R. Butler. Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.
- MAQUET, C., *Dictionnaire analogique*. Paris, Larousse. 40 fr.
- RHEINFELDER, H., *Altfranzösische Grammatik, I: Lautlehre*. Munich, Hueber. 6 M. 80.
- ROQUES, M., *Recueil général des lexiques français du Moyen Âge*, I (Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études). Paris, Champion. 100 fr.

- SCHOELL, F., La langue française dans le monde. Paris, d'Artrey. 40 fr.
 THURAU, ELSE, 'Galant', ein Beitrag zur französischen Wort- und Kulturgeschichte (Frankfurter Quellen, 12). Frankfurt, Diesterweg. 3 M. 20.
 WILMOTTE, M., Nos Dialectes et l'Histoire. Paris, Droz. 16 fr.

(b) *Old French.*

- Aucassin et Nicolette, ed. M. Roques (Classiques du Moyen Âge). Paris, Champion. 12 fr.
 BOSSUAT, R., La Poésie lyrique au moyen âge. Paris, Larousse. 1 fr. 50.
 DU CASTEL, Mme E., Christine de Pizan. Paris, Hachette. 30 fr.
 EICHELBERG, W., Dichtung und Wahrheit in Machauts 'Voir dit'. Diss. Düren, Spezial-Diss.-Buchdr.
 KELLERMANN, W., Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman. (Z. f. rom. Phil., Beiheft 88.) Halle, Niemeyer. 12 M.
 PAPIN, M. D., Traité de la Ballade française. Paris, Les Alpes. 15 fr.
 SYKES, SIR P., The Quest for Cathay. London, Black. 15s.
 TUSCHEN, A., Die Taufe in der altfranzösischen Literatur. Diss. Wanne-Eickel, Wolf.
 Two Old French Poems on Saint Thibaut, ed. by R. T. Hill. (Yale Rom. St., XI.) Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$2.50.

(c) *Modern French.*

- ARNDT, H., Der Stil Leconte de Lisle (Arb. z. rom. Phil., 37). Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus. 2 M.
 BALZAC, H. DE, Sténie, ed. A. Prioult. Paris, Courville. 30 fr.
 BARRIÈRE, P., La Vie intellectuelle en Périgord (1500-1800). Bordeaux, Delmas. 55 fr.
 BATIFFOL, L., Richeheu et Corneille. Paris, Calmann-Lévy. 15 fr.
 BAUER, H. F., Les Ballades de Victor Hugo (Bibl. de la RLC). Paris, Champion. 40 fr.
 BENJAMIN, R., Molière. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
 BERGER-CREPLET, M., Profils littéraires. Paris, Figuière. 12 fr.
 BERGOUNIOUX, L. A., Guillaume Du Buys (1520?-94), poète satirique du XVI^e siècle. Paris, Picard. 25 fr.
 BERNARDET, DOM E., Un abbé d'Hautecombe, ami de Ronsard. Paris, Les Alpes. 18 fr.
 BLOCH, J. R., Naissance d'une culture. Paris, Rieder. 10 fr.
 BOCK (geb. SACHS) MARGARETE, Symbolistisches in den Dramen von Alfred von Musset. Diss. Berlin, Hoffmann.
 BOURDALOUE, Sermons Choisis, ed. L. Dimier. Paris, Garnier. 12 fr.
 BRASILLACH, R., Animateurs de Théâtre. Paris, Corrèa. 12 fr.
 BREMOND D'ARS-MIGRÉ, Un collaborateur de Buffon: l'abbé Bexon. Paris, Champion. 30 fr.
 BRIDGE, J. S., A History of France from the Death of Louis XI, v: France in 1815. Oxford Univ. Press. 16s.
 BRUNET, Ombres Vivantes: Machiavel, La Fontaine, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Napoléon, Taine, Samain, Verhaeren, Remy de Gourmont. Paris, L'Étoile. 15 fr.
 CARTON, P., Léon Bloy. Paris, Le François. 40 fr.
 CATTÀ, TONY, Un Romancier de vraie France: René Bazin. Paris, Calmann-Lévy. 15 fr.
 CHATEAUBRIAND, Les Martyrs, ed. V. Giraud. Paris, Garnier. 9 fr.

- CONDAMIN, R. P., *Le grand homme de M. Albert Bayet: Voltaire*. Paris, Spes. 5 fr.
- CÔTE, L., *Armand Godoy*. Paris, Vitte. 5 fr.
- CRaveri, A., *Voltaire, politico dell' Illuminismo*. L. 15.
- DISTELBARTH, P., *Lebendiges Frankreich*. Berlin, Rowohlt. 8 M.
- DORKEN, E., *Geschichte des franzos. Michelangelobildes von der Renaissance bis zu Rodin* (Arb. z. rom. Phil., 40). Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus. 4 M.
- FAGUET, E., *Histoire de la Poésie française, XI: Au temps de la Révolution*. Paris, Boivin. 15 fr.
- FLAUBERT, G., *Œuvres, 2 vols. (Pléiade)*. Paris, NRF. 136 fr.
- FLAUBERT, G., *Trois Contes*, ed. R. Dumesnil. Paris, Belles Lettres. 18 fr.
- FROMENTIN, E., *Œuvres complètes: Dominique*, ed. M. Revon. Paris, Conard. 40 fr.
- GUICHARD, L., *L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard. L'Interprétation graphique, cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de Jules Renard*. 2 vols. Paris, Nizet et Bastard. 70 fr.
- GUIET, R., *L'évolution d'un genre: le livret d'opéra en France de Gluck à la Révolution, 1774-1793* (Smith Coll. St. in Mod. Lang., xviii). Northampton, Mass., Smith Coll. \$2.0.
- HASTINGS, H., *Man and Beast in French Thought of the Eighteenth Century* (Johns Hopkins St. in Rom. Lit. and Lang., xxvii). Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$1.25.
- JAMMES, F., *Sources*. Paris, Divan. 15 fr.
- JUNKERSDORFF, ANNE LISE, *Aufbau und Stil der Erzählungen Vignys* (Arb. z. rom. Phil., 9). Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus. 32 M.
- KNAUER, K., *Ein Künstler poetischer Prosa in der französischen Vorromantik: Jean-François Marmontel*. Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus. 6 M.
- KRAUSS, W., *Corneille als politischer Dichter* (Marburger Beiträge, 18). Marburg, Ebel. 2 M. 50.
- KRUGER, M., *Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des Nonnenklosters Port-Royal im 17. Jahrhundert (1609-1709)* (Rom. Arb., xxvi). Halle, Niemeyer. 15 M.
- LAFARGUE, P., *Critiques littéraires*. Paris, ESI. 15 fr.
- LEBBIN, ELISABETH, *Alfred de Vignys Beziehungen zu England und zur englischen Literatur*. Diss. Halle, Klincksch. 15 fr.
- LEMOINE, J., *La Première du 'Cid'*. Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.
- LEVAILLANT, M., *Deux Livres des Mémoires d'Outre-tombe, 2 vols.* Paris, Delagrave. 110 fr.
- LEVIN, L. M., *The Political Doctrine of Montesquieu's 'Esprit des Lois': its Classical Background*. New York, Institute of French Studies. \$3.50.
- MALLARMÉ, S., *Poems*, trsl. Roger Fry, commentary by Charles Mauron. London, Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6d.
- MASSIS, H., *Notre ami Psichari*. Paris, Flammarion. 12 fr.
- MICHAUT, G., *La Bruyère*. Paris, Boivin. 18 fr.
- MOERENSCHILD, D. S. VON, *Russia in the intellectual Life of Eighteenth-Century France*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.
- NATOLI, G., *Stendhal*. Bari, Laterza. L. 16.
- NIKLAUS, R., *Jean Moréas*. Paris, Presses Universitaires. 25 fr.
- PETTI, M., *La troisième République*. Paris, Larousse. 105 fr.
- PORCHÉ, F., *Verlaine*. Paris, Flammarion. 3 fr. 75.

- PRIOULT, A., Balzac avant la 'Comédie Humaine' (1818-29). Paris, Courville. 40 fr.
- PROUST, M., Correspondance générale, iv: Lettres à Madame et M. E. Straus. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- RACINE, J., Poésies, ed. G. Truc (Racine et la musique par Samazeuilh). Paris, Belles Lettres. 18 fr.
- RICHELIEU, Œuvres. Paris, Plon. 20 fr.
- ROUX, Marquis de, Études pour portraits de maîtres: Rabelais, Pascal, Racine, Bossuet. Paris, Le Divan. 15 fr.
- RUPPE, Fr., Das Problem der Landflucht im heutigen Frankreich und seine Aktualität im Werke René Bazins. Diss. Jena.
- SACHS, M., André Gide. Paris, Denoel et Steele. 6 fr.
- SAINTYVES, P., Corpus du folklore préhistorique en France et dans les Colonies françaises, III: Les Pierres à Légendes de la Normandie—de la Bretagne. Paris, Nourry. 70 fr.
- SARDOU, V., Théâtre complet, VIII. Paris, Michel. 20 fr.
- SLAUD, D., La Comédie Française. Son histoire, son statut. Paris, Pichon et Durand-Auzias. 30 fr.
- SILVER, Mrs MABEL, Jules Sardeau, l'homme et la vie. Paris, Boivin.
- STENDHAL, Mélanges intimes et Marginalia, ed. H. Martineau, 2 vols. Paris, Le Divan. 60 fr.
- TABARANT, A., Le Vrai Visage de Rétif de la Bretonne. Paris, Aubier. 24 fr.
- THIBAUDET, A., Histoire de la littérature française. Paris, Stock. 25 fr.
- TRAHARD, P., La Sensibilité révolutionnaire. Paris, Boivin. 30 fr.
- VERLAINE, P., Poèmes saturniens; La bonne Chanson (Coll. Baldi). Paris, Rombaldi. 35 fr.
- VIoux, MARCELLE, François I^{er}, le roi-chevalier. Paris, Fasquelle. 15 fr.
- VOLTAIRE, L'Ingénu, ed. W. R. Jones. Paris, Droz. 24 fr.
- WILLCOCKS, M. P., Madame Roland. London, Hutchinson. 18s.

(d) *Provençal*.

- MILLARDET, G., Le Roman de Flamenca. Paris, Boivin. 8 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

- GRIERSON, Sir H. J. C., Two Dutch Poets. (Taylorian Lecture, 1936.) Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s.
- VAN LANGENHOVE, G., Linguistische Studien, I. Antwerp, 'De Sikkel'; Paris, Leroux; s'Gravenhage, Nijhoff.

Scandinavian.

- Ordgeografi och Språkhistoria, ed. by B. Hesselman. (Nord. Text. och Undersök., 8.) Copenhagen, Levin og Munksgaard. Kr. 7.20.

English.

(a) *General, including Linguistic.*

- BRUSSEL, I. R., Anglo-American First Editions. Vol. II. London, Constable. 21s.
- Dictionary of American Biography, ed. by D. Malone. Vol. XIX. Troye-Wentworth. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 52s. 6d.
- Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, by Sir W. A. Craigie. Part IV. Communalitie-Cow. London, H. Milford, Chicago Univ. Press. 21s.
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. XXI. Collected by H. Read. London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.

- Essays by Divers Hands, xv, ed. by H. Walpole. London, H. Milford. 7s.
- LEAVIS, F. R., *Revaluation: Tradition and Development in English Poetry*. London, Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6d.
- LLOYD, L. C., *The Book Trade in Shropshire*. Shrewsbury, The Author, Wenlock Road.
- LOFFLER, K. and KIRCHNER, J., *Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens*. Vols. I, II. Leipzig, Hiersemann.
- NICOLL, A., *The English Theatre*. London, Nelson. 6s.
- Scottish National Dictionary, The, ed. by W. Grant. Vol. II, Part I. Bitterbank-Box. Edinburgh, Scottish Nat. Dict. Assoc. Subscr. price, £15 the set of 10 vols.
- WOODS, G. B., H. A. WATT, and G. K. ANDERSON, *The Literature of England*. New York, Scott, Foresman. \$3.
- WYLD, H. C., *A History of Modern Colloquial English*. 3rd ed., with additions. Oxford, Blackwell. 8s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English*.

- Book of Margery Kempe, The, A Modern Version by W. Butler-Bowdon. London, Cape. 10s. 6d.
- CHAMBERS, R. W., *Bede*. (Annual Hertz Lecture, 1936.) London, H. Milford (for the British Academy). 1s. 6d.
- LABORDE, E. D., *Byrhtnoth and Maldon*. London, Heinemann. 15s.
- OHLANDER, U., *Studies on Coordinate Expressions in Middle English*. (Lund Studies in Engl., v.) Lund, Gleerup; London, Williams and Norgate. 10 kr.
- Spiritual Songs from English MSS. of Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries, ed. by F. M. M. Comper. London, S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.
- TILGNER, E., *Die Aureate Terms als Stilelement bei Lydgate*. (Germ. St., 182.) Berlin, Ebering. 4 M. 20.

(c) *Modern English*.

- ABERDEIN, J. W., *John Galt*. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- Alfred Edward Housman, 26 March, 1859: 30 April, 1936. Bromsgrove School Bookshop. 1s. 6d.
- AMDUR, A., *The Poetry of Ezra Pound*. (Radcliffe Hons. Theses in Engl., v.) Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 5s. 6d.
- BEACH, J. W., *The Concept of Nature in Nineteenth-Century English Poetry*. New York, Macmillan Co. 21s.
- BLUNDEN, E., *Keats's Publisher, A Memoir of John Taylor*. London, Cape. 8s. 6d.
- BOAS, F. S., *From Richardson to Pinero*. London, Murray. 8s. 6d.
- BONNER, W. H., *De Quincey at Work*. Buffalo, Airport Publishers.
- Boswell's *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*, ed. by F. A. Pottle and C. H. Bennett. New York, Viking Press; London, Heinemann. 5 guineas; 21s.
- BRETON, N., *Two Pamphlets of*, ed. by E. G. Morice: *Grimello's Fortunes*; *An Olde Mans Lesson*. (Univ. of Bristol Studies, iv.) Bristol, Arrowsmith. 5s.
- BRIDGES, R., *Collected Essays, xxvii-xxx*. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 5s.
- BRONTË, C. and P. B., *Miscellaneous and Unpublished Writings*, ed. by T. J. Wise and J. A. Symington. In 2 vols. Vol. I. Oxford, Blackwell. 30s. the set.

- BROOKS, H. F., *A Bibliography of John Oldham, the Restoration Satirist.* Oxford Bibliographical Society, Proceedings, Vol. v, Part 1.
- BROOKS, Van W., *The Flowering of New England.* London, Dent. 15s.
- BURR, A., *Sir Walter Scott: An Index.* Harvard and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 6s. 6d.
- BUTT, J., *Pope's Taste in Shakespeare.* London, H. Milford (for the Shakespeare Association.) 2s.
- CAPPON, L. J., *Virginia Newspapers, 1821-1935. Part 1.* New York, Appleton-Century. 21s.
- DE LA MARE, W., *Poetry in Prose.* (Warton Lecture, 1935.) London, H. Milford (for the British Academy). 5s.
- DE SELINCOURT, E., *The Early Wordsworth.* London, H. Milford (for the English Association). 2s. 6d.
- GALT, J., *Works*, ed. by D. S. Meldrum and W. Roughead. 10 vols. Edinburgh, J. Grant. 42s. the set.
- GOW, A. S. F., A. E. Housman. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- HAMMERLE, Von Ockham zu Milton. Munchen, Tyrolia Verlag. 2 M. 70.
- HILLHOUSE, J. T., *The Waverley Novels and their Critics.* Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s.
- HONE, J., *The Life of George Moore.* London, Gollancz. 15s.
- LLOYD, C., *Fanny Burney.* London, Longmans. 10s. 6d.
- LONGMAN, C. J., *The House of Longman, 1724-1800*, ed. by J. E. Chandler. London, Longmans. 30s.
- MACLEOD, M., *A Concordance to the Poems of Robert Herrick.* New York, Oxford Univ. Press. 18s.
- MARSHALL, L. B. (ed.), *Rare Poems of the Seventeenth Century.* Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- Nebuchadnezzar's Fierie Furnace, ed. by M. Rosler. (*Materials for the study of the Old English Drama*, xii.) Louvain, Uystpruyst.
- OVERBURY, Sir T., *The Overburian Characters: to which is added A Wife*, ed. by W. J. Paylor. Oxford, Blackwell. 8s. 6d.
- Oxford Book of Modern Verse, 1892-1935*, ed. by W. B. Yeats. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.
- PATRICK, D. L., *The Textual History of 'Richard III'.* Stanford and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s.
- PICKEL, M. B., *Charles I as Patron of Poetry and Drama.* London, Muller. 6s.
- Postman's Horn, An Anthology of Letters of the latter Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. by A. Bryant. London, Longmans. 10s. 6d.
- QUINTANA, R., *The Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift.* London and New York, Oxford Univ. Press. 16s.
- REYNOLDS, E., *Early Victorian Drama.* Cambridge, Heffer. 6s.
- REYNOLDS, M. E., *Memories of John Galsworthy.* London, R. Hale. 5s.
- ROSA, M. W., *The Silver Fork School: Novels of Fashion preceding 'Vanity Fair'.* (Columbia Univ. Studies in Engl. and Comp. Lit., 123.) Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.
- SCOTT, Sir W., *Letters*, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson. Vol. xi, 1828-1831. London, Constable. 18s.
- SEN, A., *Studies in Shelley.* Calcutta, The University.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Hamlet*, ed. by J. Dover Wilson. (Revised ed.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.

- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Henry the Fourth, Part I*, ed. by S. B. Hemingway. (Variorum ed.) Philadelphia and London, Lippincott.
- Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, 72, ed. by W. Keller. Weimar, H. Bohlau. 16 M.
- SHEPPERSON, A. B., *The Novel in Motley*. Harvard Univ. Press. \$3.
- THOMPSON, R., *American Literary Annuals and Gift Books, 1825-1865*. New York, H. W. Wilson. \$2.25.
- WARREN, C. H., *Sir Philip Sidney*. London, Nelson. 7s. 6d.
- WHITFIELD, F., *Beast in View: A Study of the Earl of Rochester's Poetry* (Harvard Hons. Theses in Engl., 9). Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 6s.

German.

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- ADRIAN, K. und L. SCHMIDT, *Geistliches Volksschauspiel im Lande Salzburg*. Salzburg, Pustet. 7 M. 80.
- ALMINAUSKIS, K., *Die Germanismen des Litauischen, T. 1. Kaunas, Šv. Kazimiero D-jos Knygnas*. 6 M.
- Aus der Werkstatt. Alfred Götze zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet von Otto Diehl (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 46). Giessen, von Munschow. 3 M. 20.
- BENZ, R., *Genius im Wort* (Deutsche Reihe, 42). Jena, Diederichs. 0 M. 80.
- BORNHARDT, W., *Die Flurnamen des Stadtkreises Goslar* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stadt Goslar, H. 8). Goslar, Geschichts- und Heimatschutzverein. 3 M.
- EGGHOLM, A., *Metrische Beobachtungen mit Berücksichtigung der Versifikation im Nibelungenlied*. Kopenhagen, Hagerup. 5 M.
- ESSER, W., *Deutsche Sprache, eine Sendung*. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 3 M. 50.
- FEHR, H., *Die Dichtung im Recht* (Kunst und Recht, Bd. 3). Bern, Franke. 20 Fr.
- FRAUENFELDER, R., *Die Inkunabeln der Ministerialbibliothek Schaffhausen*. Schaffhausen, Kohn.
- HAIN, H., *Mundartgeographie des oberen Rednitzgebietes*. Nürnberg, Spindler. 2 M. 50.
- Heidenheimer Volksschauspiele. *Jahresschrift* 13 (1936). Heidenheim, Brenz. 0 M. 30.
- HELBRON, H., *Das Lied vom Grafen und der Nonne*. Quakenbrück, Kleinert.
- HELLBERG, H., *Studien zur Dialektgeographie im Ruhrgebiet und im Vest Recklinghausen* (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, H. 37). Marburg, Elwert. 6 M.
- INSAM, M., *Der Lautstand des Burggrafenamtes von Meran. Mit einer dialektgeographischen Studie*. Leipzig, Hirzel. 5 M.
- KAYSER, W., *Geschichte der deutschen Ballade*. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 8 M.
- LEINWEBER, W., *Wortgeographie der Kreise Frankenberg, Kirchhain, Marburg* (Deutsche Dialektgeographie, H. 10). Marburg, Elwert. 9 M. 50.
- LEYHAUSEN, W., *Probleme der Poetik*. Greifswald, Bamberg. 1 M. 50.
- MATTHIAS, G., *Sprachlich-sachliche Flurnamendeutung auf volkskundlicher Grundlage. Beispielhaft dargestellt an... Uelzen*. Hildesheim, Lax. 6 M.
- NECKEL, G., *Vermischte Sagen* (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Deutsche Sagen, Bd. 3). Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.

- PLUMACHER, W., Versuch einer metaphysischen Grundlegung literaturwissenschaftlicher Grundbegriffe aus Kants Antinomienlehre mit einer Anwendung auf das Kunstwerk Hermann Hesses (Bonner deutsche Studien, H. 1). Würzburg, Tritsch. 2 M.
- ROEHR, H., *Frühzeit deutscher Dichtung* (Lebendiges Wort, 25). Leipzig, List. 0 M. 75.
- ROOS, C., *Kleine deutsche Literaturgeschichte*. København, Gyldendalske Boghandel. 4 Kr. 75.
- STREITBERG, G., *Die wortgeographische Gliederung Ostsachsens und des angrenzenden Nordbohmens*. Leipzig, Jordan und Gramberg.
- VILMAR, A., *Geschichte der deutschen National-Literatur*. Bearbeitet und fortgesetzt von J. Rohr. Berlin, Safari-Verlag. 4 M. 80.
- WALLNER, E., *Die Ortsnamen des Bezirksamtes Pfaffenhofen*. Geisenfeld a. Ilm, Weinmayer.
- WEINBERG, E., *Die österreichischen Ortsnamen und ihre Bedeutung. Ein Nachschlagebuch mit einer Einführung*. Wien, Deutscher Verlag für Jugend und Volk. 3 M.
- WIECHERT, E., *Der Dichter und die Jugend*. Mainz, Werkstatt f. Buchdruck. 2 M. 50.
- WINZER, G., *Rom im Urteil germanischer Denker und Dichter, T. 1 (Deutsche Aktion, H. 3)*. Leipzig, A. Klein. 1 M.

(b) *Old Saxon and Low German*.

No entries.

(c) *Old and Middle High German*.

- BAUER, R., *Studien zum Wigalois des Wirnt von Gravenberg* (Germanische Studien, H. 180). Berlin, Ebering. 5 M.
- BIELING, A., *Das deutsche Rolandslied im Spiegel des französischen Rolandslieds*. Düsseldorf, Nolte.
- BINDEWALD, H., *Deutsche Texte aus schlesischen Kanzleien des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts* (Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation, Bd. 9, Hälfte 2). Berlin, Weidmann. 14 M.
- BOESCH, B., *Die Kunstanschauung in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung von der Blütezeit bis zum Meistergesang*. Bern, Haupt. 8 Fr.
- EIS, G., *Drei deutsche Gedichte des 8. Jahrhunderts aus Legenden erschlossen* (Germanische Studien, H. 181). Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 60.
- FLADE, S., *Vom Einfluss des Christentums auf die Germanen*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 6 M.
- FRENZEN, W., *Klagebilder und Klagegebarben in der deutschen Dichtung des hofischen Mittelalters* (Bonner Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, H. 1). Würzburg, Tritsch. 2 M. 50.
- GARBE, U., *Frauen des Merowingerhauses. Königinnen und Magde, Heilige und Dirnen. Ein Beitrag zur Sittengeschichte der Zeit des Kulturbruchs* (Reden und Aufsätze zum nordischen Gedanken, H. 38). Leipzig, A. Klein. 1 M. 20.
- JAIDE, W., *Wesen und Herkunft des mittelalterlichen Hexenwahns im Lichte der Sagaforschung* (Reden und Aufsätze zum nordischen Gedanken, H. 39). 0 M. 70.
- LERNER, L., *Studien zur Komposition des hofischen Romans im 13. Jahrhundert* (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, H. 7). 2 M.
- MERTENS, H., *Die Form der deutschen Predigt bei Berthold von Regensburg*. Würzburg, Werkbunddruckerei.

SCHARMANN, T., Studien über die *Saelde* in der ritterlichen Dichtung des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Würzburg, Tritsch.

TAPPER, H., Die Gestalt des Petrus in der Literatur des ausgehenden Mittelalters und des 16. Jahrhunderts. Limburg a.d. Lahn, Limburger Vereinsdruck.

(d) *Early New High German.*

WILLDE, H., Die Zeitfolge in Thomas Murners "Narrenbeschwörung" und "Schelmenzunft". Frankfurt a.M., Scheurle.

ZITZMANN, R., Fischarts "Geschichtsklitterung" in ihrem Verhältnis zu Rabelais. Limburg a.d. Lahn, Limburger Vereinsdruck.

(e) *Modern German.*

ACZÉL, M., Frauengestalten bei Theodor Storm. Quakenbruck, Trute.

ARIS, R., History of Political Thought in Germany from 1789–1815. Allen and Unwin. 15s.

ASSMANN, E., Die Entwicklung des lyrischen Stils bei Detlev von Liliencron. Königsberg, Kummel.

BIANCHI, L., Dante und Stefan George. Bologna, Zanichelli. 6 Lire.

BLANK, B., Stefan George. Symbolische deutsche Dichtung um 1900. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer.

BLUME, B., Das nihilistische Weltbild Arthur Schnitzlers. Stuttgart, Knöller.

CNYRIM, O., Jean Pauls publizistische Leistung 1796–1825. Worms, Kranzbühler.

CORRODI, H., Othmar Schoeck. Eine Monographie (Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, III. Reihe, Bd. 15). Frauenfeld, Huber. 7 M. 50.

Deutsche Dichtung, Die. Ein Jahrbuch. Hrsg. von R. Elsner. Berlin, West-Ost-Verlag. 5 M. 40.

DIEKMANN, E., Christian Dietrich Grabbe. Der Wesensgehalt seiner Dichtung. Detmold, Meyer'sche Hofbuchhandlung. 4 M. 50.

FEDERMANN, A., Johann Heinrich Meyer, Goethes Schweizer Freund, 1760–1832 (Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, Bd. 82). Frauenfeld. 3 Fr.

FONTANE, Theodor, Neunundachtzig bisher ungedruckte Briefe und Handschriften von. Hrsg. von R. v. Kehler. Berlin, Elsner.

FINK, G., Ludwig Finckh. Leben und Werk. Tübingen, Heine. 2 M. 50.

FREDE, L., Die zeitgenössischen Goethe-Medaillen. Berlin-Wilmersdorf, Deutsche Münzblätter.

FUCHS, G., Studien zur Übersetzungstheorie und -praxis des Gottschedkreises. Versuch einer Wesensbestimmung des nachbarocken Klassizismus.

GAUHE, U., Jean Pauls Traumdichtungen. Bonn, Bonner Universitäts-Buchdr. 4 M.

Gerhart Hauptmann Jahrbuch, Bd. 1. Hrsg... von F. Voigt. Breslau, Marschke und Berendt. 10 M.

Goethes Briefwechsel mit Marianne von Willemer. Neu hrsg. von M. Hecker. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 7 M. 50.

Goethe-Kalender. Hrsg. vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum. Leipzig, Dietrich. 3 M. 50.

Goethe über England und die englische Literatur. Überreicht von C. Poeschel und J. Rodenberg. Leipzig, Poeschel und Trepte.

Grabbe-Woche 1936, Festschrift zur, anlässlich der hundertsten Wiederkehr von Christian Dietrich Grabbes Todestag. Münster-in-W., Landesstelle Westfalen-Nord.

- Groth, Klaus, An die Buchhandlung Opitz (Nach der Handschrift gedruckt von F. Schult). Gustrow, Michaal.
- Groth, Klaus, Briefe an Joachim Mahl. Hrsg. . . von W. Eberhardt. Kiel, Wissenschaftl. Ges. f. Literatur u. Theater.
- HALLEMORE, G., Das Bild Laurence Sternes in Deutschland von der Aufklärung bis zur Romantik. Berlin, Ebering.
- HALPERIN, N., Die deutschen Schriftstellernnen in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts (Versuch einer soziologischen Analyse). Quakenbruck, Trute.
- HANSEN, M., Ernst Moritz Arndt. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung seiner Persönlichkeit und Gedankenwelt. Hamburg, Evert.
- HAUSER, O., Gustav Frenssen als niederdeutscher Dichter (Form und Geist, Bd. 40). Leipzig, Eichblatt. 5 M.
- Hebbel, Fr., Der Mensch und die Mächte. Die Tagebücher [Auszüge], ausgewählt und eingeleitet von E. Vincent (Kroners Taschenausgabe, Bd. 144). Leipzig, Kroner. 3 M. 75.
- HEDERER, E., Friedrich von Hardenbergs "Christenheit oder Europa". Zeulenroda, Sporn.
- HELLINGRATH, N. von, Holderlin Vermächtnis. München, Bruckmann. 3 M.
- HELLWEG, G., Nikolaus Gryses Schriften als Quelle für Volksglauben und Sitte des 16. Jahrhunderts. Teildr. Hamburg.
- HESSELBACHER, K., Paul Gerhardt, der Sänger des frohlichen Glaubens. Leipzig, Schloessmann. 3 M. 60.
- HEUKELUM, H. van, Ruhmen, das ist's! Studien zu späten Gedichten Rainer Maria Rilkes. Würzburg, Mayr.
- JACOBY, K., Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Bibliographie (Hamburger Beiträge zur Buchkunde, Bd. 5). Berlin, Maximiliangesellschaft. (Hperg.) 15 M.
- JUD, H., Zur Wortkunst Heinrich Federers. Menzingen, Buchdruck. Inst. Menzingen.
- KAPPLER, H., Der barocke Geschichtsbegriff bei Andreas Gryphius (Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie, H. 13). Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 2 M. 60.
- KAUBISCH, M., Rainer Maria Rilke. Mystik und Künstlertum. Dresden, Jess. 2 M.
- KIPPENBERG, A., Der Wandel der Faustgestalt bis zu Goethe. Leipzig, Poeschel und Trepte.
- KLATT, F., Rainer Maria Rilke. Sein Auftrag in heutiger Zeit. Berlin, L. Scheider. 1 M. 85.
- KNOTE, W., Hermann Lingg und seine lyrische Dichtung. Würzburg, Mayr.
- KRETSCHMER, E., Die Weisheit Rainer Maria Rilkes. Weimar, Böhlau.
- Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft. Hrsg. von G. Müller, Bd. 8. Freiburg, Herder. 8 M.
- LOFFLER, F., Das Körnerhaus in Dresden (Geschichtliche Wanderfahrten, 47). Dresden, Heinrich. 0 M. 60.
- LOHNER, H., Deutschlands Anteil an der italienischen Romantik (Sprache und Dichtung, H. 62). Bern, Haupt. 6 Fr.
- LUDTKE, H., Goethe und das Altonaer Schrifttum (Niederelbingen, Nr. 9). Altona, Lorenzen. 0 M. 75.
- LUDWIG, OTTO, Tagebücher. Hrsg. von K. Vogtherr. Bd. 1. Weimar, Böhlau.
- MAIER, R., Ruth Schaumann. Wesen und Wandlung der lyrischen Form. Limburg a.d. Lahn, Limburger Vereinsdruck.
- MENKE-GLUCKERT, E., Goethe in Dresden. Dresden, Focke und Oltmanns. 2 M. 80.

- MEYER, H., Das Übersinnliche bei Hermann Stehr (Germanische Studien, H. 179). Berlin, Ebering. 4 M.
- MEYER, R., Goethe. Der Heide und der Christ. Stuttgart, Urachhaus. 4 M.
- MOSER, P., Christian Gryphius. Ein schlesischer Dichter des ausgehenden 17. Jahrhunderts. Würzburg, Triltsch.
- NITSCHKE, D., Studien zum Gottsuchertum in der schlesischen Literatur. Braunschweig Ostpr., Ermland.
- PLATEN, A. von, Gedächtnisschrift der Universität Erlangen zum hundertsten Jahrestag des Todes von August von Platen. Hrsg. von E. Stollreither. Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek. 6 M.
- PLEHWE, A., Johann George Scheffner.
- PONITKE, H., Das Lebensbild eines deutschen Ingenieurs und Dichters. Max Maria von Weber. Dresden, Volkmann. 1 M. 20.
- REICHEMANN, E., Heinrich Zschokkes Weltanschauung in den Jugendjahren. Borna, Noske. 5 M. 40.
- RILKE, Rainer Maria, Briefe aus Muzot: 1921–1926. Leipzig, Insel Verlag. 7 M. 50.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria, Sonnets to Orpheus. The German Text, with an English Translation. Introduction and Notes by J. Leishman. London, Hogarth Press. 8s. 6d.
- ROEDL, U., Adelbert Stifter. Geschichte seines Lebens. Berlin, Rohwalt. 5 M. 50.
- SCHAFER, J., Das Nationalgefühl Grimmelshausens. Würzburg, Mayr.
- SCHMIDT, A., Zur Kunstform des Gegenwartsromans. Wien, Luser. 1 M. 50.
- SCHMIDT, F., Maler Müllers dramatisches Schaffen und die deutsche Literatur. Strassburg, Heitz.
- SCHWARZE, K., Der siebenjährige Krieg in der zeitgenössischen deutschen Literatur (Neue Forschungen, 29). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 10 M.
- SPIECKER, F., Luise Hensel als Dichterin. Eine psychologische Studie... auf Grund ihres Nachlasses. Mit einem Anhang bisher unveröffentlichter Lieder. Freiburg, Herder. 4 M. 80.
- STEINER, J., Rilkes Verhältnis zu seiner Zeit. Bückeburg, Prinz.
- STENTZEL, E., Der Entwicklungsgedanke in Goethes "Dichtung und Wahrheit". Leipzig, Noske. 3 M.
- STROHL, J., Lorenz Oken und Georg Buchner. Zürich, Verlag der Corona.
- THEORSTEIN, U., Hermann Löns und seine volkische Sendung. Minden, Köhler. 3 M. 75.
- VANCSA, K., Ferdinand Raimund. Ein Dichter und Biedermeier (Österreichische Biographien, H. 2). Wien, Tyrolia. 0 M. 60.
- WEDEMANN, K., Schiller und das Mittelalter. Hamburg, Evert.
- WEHE, W., Eichendorffs Romane in ihren geistes- und formgeschichtlichen Zusammenhängen. Würzburg, Triltsch.
- WENTZLAFF-EGGEBERT, F., Dichtung und Sprache des jungen Gryphius. Die Überwindung der lat. Tradition und die Entwicklung zum deutschen Stil. Berlin, De Gruyter. 7 M. 50.
- WERKMEISTER, W., Der Stilwandel in deutscher Dichtung und Musik des 18. Jahrhunderts (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Musikwissenschaft, Bd. 4). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 6 M. 30.
- WILDGANS, ANTON, Briefe. Hrsg. Lilly Wildgans. Wien, Österr. Bundesverlag. 10 M.
- ZANDER, T., Der Volksbildner Jeremias Gotthelf. Limburg a.d. Lahn, Limburger Vereinsdruck.

'THE BARBAROUS METRE OF BARCLAY'

METRICAL study of a fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century versifier may be undertaken with either of two ends primarily in view. First, we may be investigating the historical significance of the man's work in relation to the Chaucerian heroic system and its decay. Secondly, we may be concerned merely or mainly with his independent metrical worth. In the first case we shall use as our touchstone the Chaucerian heroic itself, and in collecting our data we shall be constantly noting the degree of correspondence with and divergence from that criterion that we find. In the second inquiry we shall be occupied first and foremost with whether our author wrote metrical or lawless verse, and, if his verse is metrical, with whether or not he displayed artistic sense in its management: here the Chaucerian criterion is not necessarily in question at all.

Now in proposing an independent study of Barclay with the second of these aims in view, I do so in the belief that his bad name is to some extent due to historians failing to distinguish between the two lines of approach I have indicated—to their allowing impatience with the fact that Barclay did not write Chaucerian heroics to obscure the other fact (for fact I hold it to be) that he wrote metrical verse. Let me give the grounds for this belief by reviewing some characteristic estimates of his work.

This is Courthope's judgement:

Nor can he claim any praise as an inventor of metrical harmony. Writing, like Skelton, at a time when Chaucer's system of versification had become inapplicable to the altered conditions of the vocabulary, he shows no sense of the rhythmical changes which were required by the almost total disappearance from the spoken language of the sign of inflection. The extracts which have been made above from his *Eclogues* demonstrate that, so long as his lines contained five accents, he was content, without caring whether the line was measured by an equal number of syllables, or whether the accent fell in its proper place.¹

As I hope to show, the *Eclogue*-metre is capable of more exact analysis than that, but let that pass for the moment. The point to note now is that Courthope recognizes that the lines of the *Eclogues* are connected by a definite metrical principle, but that instead of giving Barclay due credit for this evidence of rhythmical sense in an age of metrical anarchy, he subordinates it entirely to the fact that he did not write syllabically regular heroics. So far does this subordination go, that it is from the *Eclogues*, rather than from the work of Bradshaw or Neville or Hawes or Fabyan, for instance, among Barclay's contemporaries, that he elects to

¹ *A History of English Poetry*, I, 390.

illustrate 'the ruin wrought by time in Chaucer's metrical system'.¹ Thus Courthope is led to pillory as a piece of arch-decadence the very work which he acknowledges as consistently five-accent in character.

As for Saintsbury, he does not credit Barclay with even this measure of metrical sufficiency. He is content to dismiss him in a short paragraph, with the remark that 'what has been said of Hawes may be said, and underlined, of Barclay': as in Hawes, so in Barclay, 'but even more, the individual lines are crowded with what *may* be trisyllabic feet in a manner which suggests radical uncertainty as to what measure he is really aiming at'.² So much is Saintsbury convinced that Barclay's verse is doggerel, that even when he makes an advance on Courthope by admitting that the man may not have been even trying to write Chaucerian verse he sees no reason to modify his judgement substantially:

The amazing 'flounder' of the worst stanzas of Hawes and Barclay becomes certainly less incomprehensible, though not much less amazing, if we regard it as not merely a failure to produce good Chaucerian decasyllables, but an attempt—a failure likewise, but a less hopeless failure—to produce something else.³

This is not ancient critical history. It is the established attitude at the present time. Thus Dr Tillyard, in a brief statement of Wyatt's metrical antecedents, remarks that fifteenth-century linguistic changes 'resolved the five-foot iambic line of Chaucer to chaos', so that though the language of Barclay and Hawes is not so very different from ours of to-day 'their sense of rhythm appears simply barbaric'.⁴ This is not merely a relative historical estimate, for Dr Tillyard continues:

In Barclay and Hawes... there is no unifying pattern. If you read one line in a certain way, you will probably find that the next or the next but one cannot be read in that way; and in fact that the only way to read these people's verses is to gabble them breathlessly with the hopeful intention of lighting on four main accents a line.⁵

Gone is the passing admission of five-stress system; gone the admission—thrown in as an afterthought—that there may be other alternatives besides heroic and lawlessness: all is chaos and barbaric sense of rhythm. Such a conclusion, I would suggest, can only be the result of reading Barclay with the preconception that his verse is chaotic, and as for this preconception itself, I believe that its origin is to be found in the historians' practice of judging him by the Chaucerian standard, finding him wanting, and leaving the matter at that.⁶

Apart from tacit and often perhaps but half-conscious comparison with Chaucer, a second habit of metrical historians has prejudiced Barclay's reputation—the habit of invariably coupling his name with that of

¹ *A History of English Poetry*, II, 88.

² *A History of English Prosody*, I, 240.

³ *Ib.*, p. 294.

⁴ *The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, p. 17.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 18.

⁶ For my reading of the passage which Dr Tillyard quotes to show the lawlessness of Barclay's (and Hawes') work, see p. 369 below.

Hawes. Just as the fifteenth century raised up its Chaucer-Gower-Lydgate trinity, so we have inherited the Elizabethan 'Wyatt and Surrey' and have invented our own 'Lydgate and Hoccleve', our own 'Hawes and Barclay'. In the history of metre such loose chronological groupings are apt to be very misleading indeed: if there is one lesson that study of post-Chaucerian versification has taught me more clearly than another, it is the fallacy of supposing that because two men are writing at the same time they are necessarily writing the same kind of verse. As for the Hawes-Barclay identification, it is usually the *Pastime of Pleasure* and the *Ship of Fools* that are in question. The first of these can be read only as a haphazard collection of heroics and four-stress verses;¹ the second is written in equivalenced heroics. The two are thus essentially different in metrical character.² Yet to such lengths has the postulation of Hawes-Barclay similarity gone that it is from the *Eclogues* alone (which, as we shall see, are even less like the *Pastime* than the *Ship* is) that Courthope illustrates the ruin of the Chaucerian system apparent in Hawes-or-Barclay, and from the *Ship of Fools* only that Dr Tillyard quotes to show Hawes-and-Barclay's lack of unifying pattern.

One further source of error in metrical criticism of Barclay must be pointed out. The *Ship of Fools* has monopolized so much attention, and students of the *Eclogues* have been so reticent on the subject of metre,³ that descriptions of Barclay's versification and judgements of his metrical worth have inevitably been based almost entirely on the *Ship* alone. Thus the interesting fact has been overlooked that the *Ship*-metre and the *Eclogue*-metre are not identical.⁴

¹ Unmetrical as it is, the *Pastime* is a good deal better than this brief description would suggest, and shows a greater approach to metrical consistency than most fifteenth-century writings in this kind. Though I have made no extended count, I should say that 60 per cent of the lines are ten-syllabled heroics and a larger proportion five-accented. Dr W. E. Mead gives an admirable account of the verse in the introduction to his E.E.T.S. edition (pp. xcii-xcix).

² Let me state the essential differences in greater detail. First, and fundamentally, the *Ship* is metrical, the *Pastime* non-metrical; for though there is an admixture of four-stress lines in both, such verses recur frequently and altogether at haphazard in the *Pastime*, while in the *Ship* they are extremely rare. Secondly, the two works have a different average of line length: there are rather more equivalenced than unequivalenced heroics in the *Ship*; in the *Pastime* the unequivalenced heroic clearly predominates. Thirdly, as for departures from the average—the *Ship* has exceedingly little syllabic 'deficiency'; the *Pastime* definitely prefers it to 'redundance'.

³ Gregory Smith (*The Transition Period*, p. 31) singles out the *Eclogues* as Barclay's 'best poetic work', but does not discuss their metre. For Herford (ed. *Shepherd's Calendar*, p. xxxiv) they are in 'rough-shod verse'. As for editors of the *Eclogues*, Fairholt has nothing at all on metre, and Miss Beatrice White finds a single sentence sufficient: 'The versification is [a] little rough, but not unpleasant' (ed. E.E.T.S., p. ix).

⁴ Saintsbury, who does take the *Eclogues* into account—for he quotes in a footnote from the third *Eclogue* as well as from the *Ship* (*op. cit.*, I, 240)—nevertheless detects no difference between his own extracts.

Such, I believe, are the reasons why Barclay's versification is so universally and indiscriminately condemned. Preoccupation with something else besides the immediate object of study (the man's verse itself), the resultant search for either syllabically regular heroics or chaos (and nothing else but these), impatience with the men who did not write Chaucerian heroics and so the habit of lumping together half-a-dozen writers, it may be, without bothering to find out in what respects they differ—all this has resulted in failure to read Barclay in the same tolerant spirit as one would a modern, listening, that is, to the speech cadences of his verse in the hope that an underlying basis of rhythmical correspondence will emerge. Employing this last, the obvious and only fair and critical method, I shall try and substantiate the two following propositions:

- (1) The *Eclogues* are written in verse of mechanical regularity.
- (2) The line structure of the *Ship of Fools*, though admitting much greater freedom, is also essentially metrical.

(1) THE 'ECLOGUE'-METRE IS ONE OF MECHANICAL REGULARITY

In the more disorderly verse of the fifteenth century unmistakable heroics tend commonly to have these features, a fixed and often strongly marked cæsure after the fourth place, plentiful trisyllabic substitution and frequent 'epic cæsure'. Barclay's *Eclogues*, I hold, are written in a metre which, while it incorporates these elements, delimits the occurrence of the second.

What I may call the 'Barcleian' is divided at four. In the first hemistich there is usually epic cæsure, sometimes a trisyllabic foot and sometimes (though rarely) both; in the second hemistich the arrangement $\times \times' \times \times'$ is almost always unmolested. Accordingly, the formula goes thus,

$$(\times) \times \times' (\times) \times \times' (\times) || \times \times' \times \times',$$

the arrangements allowed in the first hemistich being

$$\begin{array}{c} \times \times' \times \times' \\ \times \times' \times \end{array}$$

(these are the most usual) and

$$\begin{array}{c} \times \times' \times \times' \\ \times \times' \times \times' \\ \times \times' \times \times' \\ \times \times' \times \times' \\ \times \times' \times \times' \\ \times \times' \times \times' \end{array}$$

(which are comparatively rare).

Let me illustrate with some figures. Analysing the Prologue (140 lines)
I find

71 lines with epic cæsura ¹	50.7 per cent
42 normal heroics	30.0 per cent
12 lines with trisyllabic first foot	8.6 per cent
13 lines with trisyllabic second foot	9.3 per cent
1 line with trisyllabic second foot and epic cæsura	0.7 per cent
and 1 line with trisyllabic third foot	0.7 per cent

this last

What shall I speake of the father auncient (37)

a departure from the usual formula. Taking another passage at random
(iv, 629-728) I get

64 lines with epic cæsura. ²
25 normal heroics.
1 line with trisyllabic first foot.
1 line with trisyllabic first foot and epic cæsura.
9 lines with trisyllabic second foot.

As we see from these counts, the verse with epic cæsura and not the normal heroic is the average line. Its constant recurrence throws into relief the bipartite character of the movement. In further illustration I give the concluding lines of each book:

I graunt | ^{x x /} Coridon, || take vp thy bottell sone,
 Lesse is | ^{x / x} the burthen || nowe that the drinke is done,
 Lo here | ^{x x /} is a sport, || our bot|^{x x /}tell is con|trary
 To a Cow|^{x x /}es vtter, || and I shall tell thee why.
 With a | ^{x / x} full vtter || retourneth home the cowe,
 So doth not | ^{x x /} the bottell || as it appereth nowe.
 Coridon, | ^{x x /} we must || haste in our iourney make,
 Or els | ^{x x /} shall the storme || vs and our shepe ouertake. (I, 1323-30)

O mar|^{x x /}uelous matter, || and well brought to an ende,
 I can | ^{x x /} not be able || thy reason to commende,
 Nor yet | ^{x x /} to rewarde || the thing that thou haste done,
 Though I | ^{x x /} had riches || and wit like Salomon.
 Thou haste me saued || by counsell sapient
 Out of hell mouth || and manyfolde torment.
 But now | ^{x x /} it is time || to draw to our cotage,
 The day | ^{x x /} is ended, || right so is our language. (II, 1363-70)

¹ Neglecting *-es*, *-ed*, *-eth* at the cæsura except in cases where *-es*, *-ed* would be sounded to-day. The above figure is thus an absolute minimum, and that given for normal heroics an absolute maximum.

² A further fifteen, classed as normal heroics, involve *-es*, *-ed*, *-eth*.

Sufferaunce ouercommeth || all malice at the last,
 Weake is that tree || which can not bide a blast,
 But heare | ^xnowe ^xmy counsell || I bid thee finally,
 Liue still | a shepheard || for playnly so will I.

That shall | ^xI ^xCornix || thy good counsell fulfill,
 To dye | ^xa shepheard || established is my will.
 So do, | or after || thou often shall repent,

Poore life | ^xis surest, || the court is but torment.

Adewe | ^xswete Cornix, || departing is a payne,
 But mirth reneweth || when louers mete againe.

(III, 815-24)

Go wre|^xtched n|^xgarde, || God sende thee care and payne,
 Our Lorde | ^xlet thee neuer || come hither more agayne,
 And as | ^xdid Midas, || God turne it all to golde

That euer | ^xthou touchest || or shalt in handes holde,
 For so muche | ^xon golde || is fixed thy liking,

That thou | ^xdespisest || both vertue and cunning.

(IV, 1153-8)

Haue done | ^xnowe Faustus, || lay there a straw and rest,
 Fill we | ^xour bely || with cruddes that is best.

Leaue we | ^xthe Citie || and all ciuill outrage,

Nowe is | ^xit season || to turne to the potage,

After | ^xour diner || is best as in my minde

The rest | ^xto declare, || if ought remayne behinde.

(V, 1015-20)¹

Such, then, is the usual formula. But while it is observed almost invariably, occasional departures from it are to be found. A few verses, for instance, do admit trisyllabic substitution in the second hemistich, e.g.

¹ The rare variation with trisyllabic first and second feet is not illustrated above. The following are examples:

In the side | of his felte || there stacke a spone of tree (I, 150)
 With fewe men | if he vse || familiaritie (III, 431)
 At the last | she commaunded || the eldest to procede (V, 304)
 These dwell not | vpon londe, || but haunteth the cyte (V, 735)

One or two verses have a *tetrasyllabic* foot in the first hemistich, e.g.

To car|^xy mine owne selfe || was all that euer I might (I, 615)
 To an|^xy of them all || if there lay wayes twayne (I, 622)
 But in a com|^xmon In || if that thou lodge or lye (III, 129)
 Are bus|^xy in thy chamber, || chatting with none effect (III, 140)
 For bet|^xter be without || wet to the skin with rayne (III, 219)
 For com|^xmonly as sone || as any man is dead (III, 331)

Trisyllabic third foot

(A hooke in his hande) in the mid dest of his good	(I, 156)
Mine arowe toucheth of them no thing but the bill	(I, 318)
Drinke better, and then in the name of God begin	(I, 574)
Coridon the court is the bayt ing place of hell	(I, 586)
Of these all shall be my commun ication	(I, 653)

Trisyllabic fourth foot

Mary Syr by this I see by exper ience	(I, 371)
And to win laudes and prayse of the com montie	(I, 477)
And he is a foole, a sotte, and a geke also	(I, 597)
And both day and night to put to our dil igence	(II, 45)

Trisyllabic fifth foot (?)

For neuer shall thy meate be set to thee in season (:vexation)	(II, 623)
The gad & the whip, the matt oke & the whelebarowe	(V, 384)

Again, there are lines where the break is after the fifth and not the fourth place, or alternatively, where the second hemistich is catalectic, e.g.

See howe my handes are with many a gall	(I, 235)
But hay mate Cornix see where be we nowe	(I, 554)
Farre from the matter where we first began	(I, 555)
That is hardly saide man, by the roode of rest	(I, 587)
Codrus the richest Shepherde of our coast	(II, 5)
Platters and dishes, mortar and poteroles	(II, 565)
The longe yse cycles at the hewsys honge	(V, 65)
And made them prynces, dukes, other kynges	(V, 474)
And they fede hawkes, apes, also houndes	(V, 637)
We brynge them butter, egges, chese and woll	(V, 639)

And finally, sporadic verses may be found which resist fitting to the normal base and trip away with an inevitable four-accent movement—these, for example:

Be híd foule scábbes and feárefull French póckes	(I, 358)
But if men húnted for Gód and hye glóry (:transitóry)	(I, 479)
A bírde well ingyrded kepes wéll her nést	(II, 27)
I pláynty shall nówe decláre for thy sáke	(II, 539)
To búrne in témples well smélling incéne	(II, 545)
For sóme table clóthes be kept white and cléne	(II, 720)
And though white and brówne be bóth at one price	(II, 789)
Ór thou haste tásted a mórsell or twáyne	(II, 967)
No good dísh to súffer on bórdé to be lónge	(II, 972)
Tén handes at ónce swárme in the díshe	(II, 974)
And óft all the bróth and lícour fát	(II, 989)
Dífúsely thou speákest to vnderstánde	(II, 1128)
But máte Coridón, I téll thee befóre	(II, 1131)
But if thou with slépe at lást be opprésed	(III, 156)
Ánd that sore lábours to sleépe thee constráyne	(III, 157)
To dígge and to délue, to hédge and to díke	(V, 369)
But thou art so rúde thy paúnch is so fátte	(V, 415)

Indeed, in one or two cases Barclay temporarily loses his scheme in this way throughout a sustained passage. The following is an instance:

Then shall some slouen thee dashe on the eare,
 Thou shrinkest for shame thy bread leauing there.
 My bagge full of stones and hooke in my hande
 Should geue me a courage suche boldly to withstand.
 Not so Coridon, they fare like to currees,
 Together they cleaue more fast then do burres,
 Though eche one with other ofte chide, braule & fight,
 Agaynst a poore stranger they shewe all their might.
 It is a great mastery for thee Coridon alone
 To strue to contende with many mo then one,
 A strawe for thy wisdome and arte[s] liberall,
 For fauour and coyne in court worketh all.

(II, 867-78)¹

All this last matter about aberration from the formula has reference to only a negligible proportion of the lines. I must insist that the average, and roughly speaking, universal, movement of the *Eclogues* is one of strict and mechanical regularity, strict because we can read the verse with confidence that every line will be an intelligible variation upon the same norm, mechanical because three or four expected, unmodified and unsubtle rhythms recur constantly, the demands of the metre and not also the meaning of their word content determining their character. Such being the case, Barclay deserves to be credited with an ear for rhythm (of the more obvious and stereotyped kind) and a degree of metrical conscientiousness unusual at the time when these poems were written.

While the results of this analysis would appear to be quite novel, I really think that they were largely anticipated by Courthope, though on account of his Chaucerian preoccupations he failed to give them adequate statement and consideration. For, to begin with, the pointing of his specimen from the *Eclogues* is thoroughly acceptable.² And further, his comment upon it recognizes (1) that there is a fixed cæsure and (2) that the first hemistich has the greater syllabic liberty, but unfortunately not also (3) that the second has virtually none at all.³ This is how the comment runs:

¹ So also II, 933-51. Like parts of More's *Twelve Rules*, these passages are of the greatest interest in showing how very powerful a disruptive force the four-accent rhythm could be at this time for a man using another measure—even when the other measure was clearly apprehended. (Notice, by the way, that they contain random heroics—of the usual 'Barcleian' type—e.g. the fourth, ninth, tenth and (?) eleventh in the piece quoted above.)

² *Op. cit.*, II, 88-9. The passage is a typical one. Of the fourteen lines, Courthope marks ten as having epic cæsure (two with -ed at the cæsure, two with -eth) and three others as having trisyllabic second foot (two of them depending on -eth).

³ I am not aware of any other account of the *Eclogue*-metre that mentions even one of these factors. Clearly a recognition of the first is the most fundamental, for upon it depends the propriety first of distinguishing two hemistichs at all, and so of determining their individual character. Yet this fundamental factor is actually denied by Miss Hammond, who writes with reference to both the *Ship of Fools* and the *Eclogues*: 'Generally speaking, Barclay's rhythm, although without technical beauty or conscious management, runs free from the Lydgatian gasping half-line movement' (*English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, p. 297).

In order to compress these lines within the iambic movement it is clear that many syllables have to be swallowed up, especially before the cæsura, while the cæsura itself is invariably placed, in Lydgate's mechanical manner, after the fourth syllable.¹

¹ *Op. cit.*, II, 89. It is, I hope, hardly necessary for me to point out here that I do not hold with wanting to compress the lines within the iambic movement when it is clear that that was not Barclay's desire, except, almost invariably, in the second hemistich. But I cannot so lightly pass over what is probably the result of this faulty method of approach—Courthope's belief that Barclay falsified the accentuation of his words in order to fit them to the metre. Thus in the place we are considering, Lydgate and Barclay are quoted to show how 'the chaotic modes of accentuation [my italics], with which Wyatt's predecessors were content, had almost buried out of his sight the regularity of the principle on which the father of English verse had proceeded'. And in the passage given above on p. 353, Courthope claims that his extracts from the *Eclogues* demonstrate Barclay's indifference as to 'whether the accent fell in its proper place' or not. All I can do is to reply with a direct negative. There is no need at all to warp the accent in reading the *Eclogues*: their language is richly colloquial; their accentuation is scarcely less so. In illustration, I point the passages (as they are given in vol. I, pp. 388-90) which for Courthope prove the reverse:

But of | our purpose || now for to speake agayne,
 Few prin|ces give that || to which them selfe attayne.
 Trust me, | Corydon, || I tell | thee by | my soule,
 They robbe | Saint Peter || therwith to cloth Saint Powle.
 And like | as dayly || we both may see and here,
 Some pill | the churche, || therewith to leade the quere.
 While men | promoted || by such rapine are glad,
 The wretch|es pyllled || mourne, and be wo and sad.
 Thus ought | we to live || as having all in store,
 But nought | possessing, || or caring nought | therefore,
 What should christ|en men || seeke far|ther for | richesse?
 Having food | and cloth || it is | ynough | doubtlesse,
 And these | may our lord || give un|to us | truly,
 Without prin|ces service || or courtly mis|ery.
 Anoth|er thing is || yet greatly more | damnable,
 Of ras|colde poetes || yet is a shamefull rable,
 Which voide | of wisdom || presum|eth to | indite,
 Though they | have scantly || the cunn|ing of | a snite,
 And to | what vices || that princes most intende,
 That dare | these fooles || solemn|ize and | commende.
 Alas ! | Amyntas, || nought bid|eth that | is good,
 No, not | my cokers, || my tabert, nor my hood;
 All is | consumed, || all spent | and worne be, [I postulate 'woren']
 So is | all goodnesse || and welthe | of the | cyte,
 The tem|ples pyllled || dothe bytt|erly | complayne,

If instead of 'especially before the cæsura' Courthope had written 'before the cæsura and practically never after it', the picture would have been complete.¹

Poore peo|ple wayleth, || and cal for helpe in vayne;
 Poore wyd|ous sorowe, || and chyl|dren fath|erles
 In vayne | bewayleth, || whan wol|ves them oppresse.
 Syn hath | no scourge || and vertu no rewarde,
 Who lov|eth wisdom || his for|tune is | but harde'
 Counceyll | and cun|nyng || now tom|bles in | the dust:
 But what | is the cause? || lawe tourn|ed is to lust:
 Lust stand|eth in stede || of lawe | and of | justyce;
 Whereby | good lyvynge || subdued is by vyce.

¹ The *Eclogue*-metre reappears, I believe, in the *Mirror of Good Manners*, though here lines with epic cæsura are altogether outnumbered by those with one trisyllabic foot and epic cæsura. As in the *Eclogues*, so in the *Mirror*, there is rigidly fixed cæsura and (almost invariably) six-syllabled second hemistich; but the lines of the *Mirror* differ from those of the *Eclogues* in having the first hemistich also, as a rule, six-syllabled. It is this fact, no doubt, that leads Professor Berdan to adopt the view that the two poems are written in different metres: 'Heroic couplets are used for the *Eclogues*'—'somewhat amorphous couplets' (p. 480)—'and couplets of sixes for the *Mirror of Good Manners*' (*Early Tudor Poetry*, p. 253). There is a further fact about the *Mirror*, however, which Professor Berdan's categorical statement does not bring out. While in the second hemistich the speech rhythm of the words is always a satisfactory equivalent for three iambs, this could be true of a relatively small proportion only of the initial hemistichs. The choice accordingly lies between these alternatives—on the one hand six-beat lines in which the speech accent is constantly overridden in the first hemistich, and on the other Barcleians (a number of them with a tetrasyllabic foot) in which the usual line has both a trisyllabic foot and epic cæsura. The postulate upon which the first of these hypotheses is based—that Barclay sacrificed speech rhythm to metre and did not reconcile them—is so patently at variance with my conclusions with regard to the *Eclogues* that I naturally adopt the second. Such being my line of approach, the following is an analysis of a passage of a hundred lines chosen at haphazard (Spenser Society reprint, pp. 81-3, l. 2):

- 25 lines with trisyllabic first foot and epic cæsura.
- 28 lines with trisyllabic second foot and epic cæsura.
- 14 lines with trisyllabic first foot.
- 7 lines with trisyllabic second foot.
- 4 lines with trisyllabic first and second feet.
- 6 lines with epic cæsura.
- 3 lines with tetrasyllabic first foot.
- 8 lines with tetrasyllabic second foot.
- 4 lines with tetrasyllabic second foot and epic cæsura.
- 1 normal heroic.

And here are two specimen passages from other parts of the work, pointed so as to indicate my reading of the lines:

Eche oth|er to comfort || when is necessitie,
 Thus rea|son conioyneth || the bondes of concorde,
 It peace | reconcileth, || loue, fayth and charitie
 Betwixt king | and kinge, || and betwene lorde and Lorde,
 Thus rea|son by Iustice || excludeth all discorde:

(2) THE LINE STRUCTURE OF THE 'SHIP OF FOOLS' IS LOOSER THAN THAT OF THE 'ECLOGUES', BUT IT, TOO, IS ESSENTIALLY METRICAL

That the *Ship* is not written in Barcleians is obvious from even a superficial examination of the earlier work. Admittedly when we open the poem at the prefatory excusation (which was doubtless written last) we come upon Barcleians in the very first stanza:

Go Boke: | abasshe the || thy rudenes to present.
 To men anaunced || to worshyp, and honour.
 By byrthe | or fortune: || or to men eloquent.
 By thy | submyssion || excuse thy Translatour.
 But whan | I remember || the comon behauour
 Of men: I thynke || thou ought to quake for fere
 Of tungen | enuyous || whose venym may the dere.

But as we read on it becomes increasingly evident that the basic conception is much looser than that which underlies the verses of the

For while eu|ery person || by Iustice hath his right,
 It is a brut|all fury || in battayle for to fight.
 But such | as in riches || and reason doth habounde
 By the gift | of God, || to them graunted of grace,
 With rich|es and reason || these strue as they are bounde
 Moste, the poore | to succour || in euery nedefull case,
 Thus gen|tlenes of man || augmenteth with solace:
 Thus man|ers augment, || thus chastised is vice,
 And ver|tue anaunced || by reason and Iustice. (p. 9)
 Accused | of peoples || and false rulers were some,
 Some cast | to wilde beastes || in peeces to be rent,
 But no man|er manace || nor payne could them ouercome,
 Weake wom|en, children, || olde fathers, and tuuent,
 Before cru|ell prouostes || standing at iudgement,
 And with | them yonge virgins || seeing their woundes blede,
 Of ty|rauntes nor torment || had neyther feare nor drede.
 No bowes nor dartes, || nor other like armour,
 Nor bright swordes drawn || to their deadly torment,
 No speares nor fyres || kindled them to deuour,
 No pris|on, no scourges, || no pitch of lothly cent,
 No threat|ning of prison, || nor vtter punishment,
 No hung|er nor thirst, || nor feruent oyle brenning,
 Could moue | them to chaunge || their fayth nor pure liuing. (p. 43)

Eclogues. For to begin with, there are several lines with trisyllabic foot in the second hemistich:

Be this thy Excuse || to^x content^x | theyr mynde withal (2)¹

My speche is rude || my termes com|on^x and rural (2)

Whome thou for vyce || dost sharp|ly^x rebuke^x | and blame (2)

Thoughe Barclay haue || presumed | of^x audac^xite (3)

For yf I had tungen || an hun|dreth^x: and wyt | to fele (4)

And syn of the worlde: || ne theyr braunch|es^x comprehende (4)

Then there are a few verses with the break at five:

That any goode man: vertuous and Just (2)

But I pray you reders haue ye no dysdayne (3)

But he myght be Captayne of a Shyp of Foles (3)

Yet cowde I neuer touche the vyces all (4)

And finally there is one line which may be a break-back but is more probably a four-stress line:

Wyth his yl speche shal the hurt or dere (2)

It is not that such verses do not appear in the *Eclogues* but that their occurrence there has been reduced to the barest minimum, whereas in these seventy-seven verses preliminary to the *Ship* there is a 14.3 per cent departure from the scheme of the Barcleian.

This figure, moreover, is by no means an average one. Most passages diverge even farther from the basic idea of the *Eclogue*-metre, as the following table shows:

Departures from the Eclogue-metre

	Second hemistich equivalenced ²	Cæsura at five	Cæsura else- where than at four or five	Four-stress or syllabic- ally deficient lines ³	Total departure %
Prologue (154 lines), I, 11-16	23 (14.9 %)	14 (9.1 %)	4	3	28.6
I, 19-24 l. 2 (100 lines)	15	10	0	5	30
I, 142-6 l. 9 (100 lines)	13	12	0	3	28
I, 292 l. 7-295 (100 lines)	6	7	1	7	21
II, 23-8 l. 2 (100 lines)	6	8	2	3	19
II, 166-71 l. 1 (100 lines)	13	8	6	0	27
II, 324 l. 18-328 l. 5 (100 lines)	1	9	3	0	13
II, 328 l. 6-331 (100 lines)	5	8	3	2	18
Average for these 854 lines	9.6	8.9	2.1	2.7	23.4

¹ The references to the *Ship of Fools* are to the pages of Jamieson.

² This, of course, will include lines in which both hemistichs are equivalenced. One or two departures from cæsural uniformity occur amongst the lines included in this column, but as each individual verse has a right to appear once only in the table, they are listed in this column alone.

³ Here are the lines referred to in this column:

The nómber is greát, and eche óne doth strýue (I, 13)

All are nat in béd whiche shall háue yll rést (I, 13)

We képe the stréme, and touche nat the shóre (I, 14)

In writing the *Ship*, then, Barclay did not invariably make a metrical break after the fourth place, nor did he exclude trisyllabic feet from the second hemistich. Further, he slipped into a four-accent rhythm more

Done | was his | commaund|ement | anone (I, 20)
And yét therby shall they néuer thrýue (I, 21)
On | suche chaunce || nowe for|tune throwys | hir dyce (I, 21)
That thoughe one knówe but the ýresshe gáme (I, 21)
So in | lyke wyse || I | am in | suche case (I, 21)

Of lógyke the knóttis doth lóws and vndó (I, 144)
 There is nought élse but Ést and non ést (I, 144)
 The to knówe of Lógyke the chráfte and connýnge (I, 145)

[What place is voyde of this furyous foly]
None· | so that | I dout | withun | a whyle
These fólys the hóly chúrche shall defýle (I, 294)
Ryche | or pore || hye | or lowe | of name (I, 294)
The prestis and clérkes to daúnce haue no sháme
The frére or mónke in his frócke and cówle (I, 294)
To ít comys children, máydes and wýues (I, 294)
Than lépe they about as fólke past theyr mýnde (I, 295)

That fóle, of wýsdome and reáson doth fáyle (II, 24)
 For nówe of láte hath large lónde and grounde (II, 26)
 Parchaunce mó be founde, wherin men dwéll (II, 26)
 But these wrétchys háue moche grétter héde (II, 328)
 Nowe lúge ye whére is theyr cóntynénce (II, 328)

Many of these could quite obviously be read otherwise than as I have pointed them. Two, I see, could well be regarded as syllabically normal heroics, thus:

The nom|ber is || great, and | eche óne | doth strýue
That fóle, | of wys|dome and | reason | doth fayle

But none of the others is capable of regular heroic reading without our hypothesizing strange syllabifications or printer's errors. Thus one might conceivably hazard *Of suche chaunce* or *in suche case*, remembering North's verses in the life of Julius Caesar—

My lords, I pray you hearken both to me,
 For I have seen moe years than suchie three—

or postulating parallels in these lines from the not very regular Auctoris excusatio at the conclusion of the *Castell of Labour*—

Thus suche payne so longe doth he endure
 So certaynly in suche case am I.

Or one might 'mend' 'For nowe of late' so as to read

For nowe of late hath [a] large londe and grounde.

But to act thus would be to assume, what we have no right at all to assume, that Barclay was incapable of slipping out of his metre even for a single line. No doubt some of the four-stress lines are due to the printers' headlong haste and to their not being 'perfyte in science'; but equally no doubt some are the result of Barclay's own oversight and neg-

frequently than he did in the *Eclogues*. But what most distinguishes the *Ship* from the later work is the fact that it exhibits a far greater variety of corresponding rhythms. In the above summary, for instance, the figures for equivalenced second (and first and second) hemistich include examples of as many as eighteen different arrangements of one, two or three trisyllabic feet (once a tetrasyllabic foot) with or without epic cæsura.¹ And taking into account the lines in which the first hemistich alone is equivalenced, this figure, for the passages in question, must (on my reading) be increased to thirty.²

This great variety is most noticeable, however, in the opening pages, and decreases as the work proceeds. Along with the decrease in rhythmical multiplicity goes a falling off in equivalence generally, as the following table suggests:

ligence; and it would be a useless and impossible task to try and differentiate between them.

(While I have thus refrained from tampering with the text and employing peculiar syllabifications, I find that I have in one instance supplied a word—

Nat to perysshē [by] the dyuyne commaundement (II, 169)

and that I have consistently read *world* as a dissyllable, wherever that gave an easier movement to the line, e.g.

And ouer the worlde, south north east and west	(I, 11)
That if one sought the worlde large and wyde	(I, 270)
The heuyn and erth and all the worlde large	(II, 23)
And who the sowth, thus all the worlde wyde	(II, 24)
The hole worlde leuyngē no thyngē behynde	(II, 25)
To knowe the compasse of all the worlde wyde	(II, 27)
None in the worlde swyfter as I wene	(II, 86)
The weyke hath the weyght, the worlde so doth fare	(II, 168)

With these compare the following, where I read *simple-est*, *hatered*, *payement*:

Hauynge least wyt: and symplest Science	(I, 22)
x / x / x /	
Auoyd eth this wrath hatered and debate	(I, 64)
And some sell dere bycause the payment	(II, 169).

¹ Of the 82 lines concerned, 37 have trisyllabic third foot, 10 trisyllabic fourth foot, 6 trisyllabic third foot and epic cæsura, 5 trisyllabic second and third feet, 4 trisyllabic first and third feet, 3 trisyllabic fifth foot, and 3 trisyllabic third and fourth feet. The remaining 14 are distributed thus: 2 each: trisyllabic fourth foot and epic cæsura, trisyllabic second and fourth feet and epic cæsura, trisyllabic fourth and fifth feet; 1 each: trisyllabic first and fourth feet, trisyllabic first, second, and third feet, trisyllabic second, third and fourth feet, trisyllabic second, fourth and fifth feet, trisyllabic third and fifth feet and epic cæsura, trisyllabic second, third and fifth feet and epic cæsura, trisyllabic second and fifth feet and epic cæsura, tetrasyllabic first foot and trisyllabic third.

² In this case 341 lines are involved. Verses with epic cæsura, or with the first or the second foot trisyllabic, or with epic cæsura and the second foot trisyllabic account for 308 of these. The other varieties are.

Trisyllabic first foot and epic cæsura	9
Trisyllabic first and second feet	4
Trisyllabic first and second feet and epic cæsura...	1
Tetrasyllabic first foot	2
Tetrasyllabic first foot and epic cæsura	2
Tetrasyllabic second foot	11
Tetrasyllabic second foot and epic cæsura	3
Tetrasyllabic second foot and trisyllabic first foot...	1

Numbers of equivalenced lines and of varieties of equivalenced rhythms

	First hemistich equivalenced		Second hemistich equivalenced		Both hemistichs equivalenced	
	Lines	Rhythmical varieties	Lines	Rhythmical varieties	Lines	Rhythmical varieties
Prologue	75 (48.7 %)	10	21 (13.6 %)	7	2	2
I, 19-24 l. 2	44	9	9	4	3	6
I, 142-6 l. 9	46	6	8	4	5	4
I, 292 l. 7-295	39	5	5	1	1	1
II, 23-8 l. 2	43	7	4	1	2	2
II, 166-71 l. 1	41	6	10	3	3	3
II, 324 l. 18-328 l. 5	32	4	1	1	0	0
II, 328 l. 6-331	21	2	5	2	0	0 ¹

Accordingly, as the decline in the number of rhythmical varieties means a corresponding decline in equivalence and not an increasingly pronounced bias towards any one of the equivalenced types, it is un-equivalenced heroics that become proportionately more numerous—not, as we should expect from our study of the *Eclogues*, lines with epic cæsura.²

¹ Another way of illustrating the same thing is to go syllable counting. This gives me the following results (feminine ending is disregarded):

	Number of lines of 11 syllables	Number of lines of 12 syllables	Number of lines of 13 syllables	Total number of 'extra' syllables
Prologue	73 (47.4 %)	22 (14.3 %)	3 (1.8 %)	126 (81.8 %)
I, 19-24 l. 2	38	13	8	88
I, 142-6 l. 9	43	14	2	77
I, 292 l. 7-295	40	5	0	50
II, 23-8 l. 2	39	10	0	59
II, 166-71 l. 1	40	11	2 (and 1 of 14)	72
II, 324 l. 18-328 l. 5	29	4	0	37
II, 328 l. 6-331	24	2	0	28

² Here are two extreme examples, one from the beginning, the other from the end:

^x ^x ^x [/] ^x [/] ^x
 Knowledge of trouth, | Prudence, || and rust Symplicite
 Hath vs clene left: || For we set | of them no store.
 Our Fayth | ^x ^x [/] is defyled || loue, goodnes, and Pyte:
^x ^x [/] ^x ^x
 Honest man|ers nowe || ar reput|ed of: no more.
 Lawyers ar lordes: || but Just^xice is rent | and tore.
 Or closed | lyke a Mon^xster within dores thre.
^x ^x ^x ^x ^x [/] ^x [/]
 For without mede: | or mon|ey no man can hyr se. (I, 12)
 Therefore let Folys haue theyr wordes vayne
 Whiche nought can do, but without reason chat
 All others dedes, by lewde tunge to distayne
^x [/] ^x
 And if | theyr belyes || be full, and chekis fat
 Let Clerkes speke, and they haue scorne therat
 They knowe no thinge: yet wolde, they fayne haue prayse
 And they owne dedes onely doth them please. (II, 330)

Suche is | a fole | and well | worthy | a babyll
 For he | that is | wyse wyll | no thyng | assay¹,
 Without | he knowe | howe he | well ende | it may. (I, 89)

Surely this is a perfectly intelligible piece of heroic writing. Would that it were really the worst specimen of post-Chaucerian versification!

Again, Dr Tillyard, as I have already said, goes to the *Ship* to exemplify the kind of verse that Wyatt was perforce accustomed to, verse with no unifying pattern, to be gabbled breathlessly in the hope of lighting on four main accents in each line. This is the passage he chooses² (the pointing is mine):

But moste | I marueyll || of other folys blynde
 Whiche in dyuers scyence | is ar | fast laborynge,
 Both daye and nyght with all theyr herte and mynde
 But of gram|er knowe | they lyt|yll or | no thyng
 Whiche is | the grounde | of all | lyberall | cunnynge
 Yet man|y ar besy || in Log|yke and | in lawe
 Whan all | theyr gramer || is skarsly worth a strawe. (I, 144)

Dr Tillyard actually goes so far as to say that the fourth and fifth lines are 'reducible to no rhythm'.³ To my mind the stanza is a good one, because it can be read straight off without the slightest difficulty or confusion: the lines essentially have a unifying pattern and it is ruination to impose a four-accent movement upon them by gabbling. Of course if we come to them with modern heroic rhythm in our head the amount of syllabic variation (two lines with epic cæsura, two with trisyllabic foot, one with both epic cæsura and trisyllabic foot) appears grossly excessive. But consider that Barclay is not writing modern heroic verse but verse the basic conception of which allows free employment of trisyllabic foot and epic cæsura, and no exception whatever can be taken to the stanza.

¹ Obviously this verse might also be read as a four-stress line. But it is well to reflect that this is true of all heroics with either no pause at all or else the most marked pause at five in which the fifth place is more heavily weighted than the fourth, and that when we meet with such lines in writings of acknowledged metrical skill we pass them by without demur, unconsciously giving them balance either by weighting the fourth and fifth places equally or else by making a slight and grammatically unnatural pause after the fourth. Compare, for instance,

The weight of the superincumbent hour (Adonais, xxxii, 4)
 As brightly it illustrated her woe (The Revolt of Islam,
 I, xvii, 4)

[Sooner will I with Cerberus exchange]
 My office (and his is no sinecure) (Byron: The Vision of
 Judgment, 1, 2)

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

³ P. 20.

The same applies to Saintsbury's extract:

What thinge | is more | abhomynable in | goddes syght.
 Than vicious age: || cer|tainly | no thyng.
 It is eke world|ly shame, || whan thy | corage | and mycht
 Is nere | decayed, || to kepe | thy lewde | lyuynge.
 And by exam|ple of the, || thy yonge | children | to brynge.
 Into a vic|ious lyfe: || and all | goodnes | to hate.
 Alas | age thus || thou art | the Fend|es bate.

(1, 44)

This specimen is obviously better calculated to serve its purpose than the other two we have been looking at, since the fact of its containing a break-back (1. 2) and several instances of tetrasyllabic foot brands it at once as offensive to modern taste. Yet even in this case, when the passage is not taken out of its rhythmical context, and our ear has had time to become attuned to the unaccustomed music, the lines read themselves easily and without strain as equivalenced heroics, those which might otherwise present difficulty always having an especially well-marked pause at the expected place. Nevertheless while this is so, the stanza is by no means an average specimen: just as others ask us to misread and censure lines which are (individually at any rate) perfectly admissible even to-day, Saintsbury invites us to condemn the *Ship* on the evidence of an extreme example which is patently at variance with modern taste. Undoubtedly Barclay is a man more sinned against than sinning.¹

Such, then, are the results of my attempt to reassess Barclay as a metrist. If we go to the *Eclogues* without prejudice or preconception, and read the lines with ordinary speech accentuation, an obvious underlying metrical basis at once reveals itself. And as for the *Ship*, the manner in which 'the individual lines are crowded with what *may*'—unless we unnecessarily warp the accent—'be trisyllabic'—or sometimes even tetrasyllabic—'feet' is, I submit, one which does show 'what measure' its author 'is really aiming at'.² It only remains for me to point out some of the critical implications of these conclusions.

¹ A fairly considerable list of possible or probable four-accent verses could, of course, be compiled from the pages of the *Ship*, and the occurrence of these is undoubtedly a proof that Barclay's ear and concern for rhythm were not impeccable. But, on the other hand, when we reflect that neither contemporary taste nor the traditional mode (a promiscuous agglomeration of four- and five-stress lines) provided anything but incentive and justification for introducing such verses wantonly, the fact that they form an almost negligible proportion in the *Ship* is a striking indication of its author's metrical competence.

² 'Shift the accent as we will in Barclay's verse', says Dr Tillyard (*op. cit.*, p. 20), 'we get no recognisable rhythm.' But if we do not shift the accent we do get rhythms that recognizably correspond amongst themselves.

It is worthy of note in this connexion that even a modern poet is not always free from the

The *Eclogue*-metre is a refinement of, an abstraction upon, that of the *Ship*, being the *Ship*-metre deprived of its liberty of syllabic variation in the second hemistich. This implies a growing feeling for metrical form on Barclay's part, of which further evidence may be found in the *Ship of Fools* itself, where a gradually increased restraint can be detected in the verse as the work proceeds.¹

danger of having his verses mispronounced. Thus in a note to *Nero Part II* Bridges quotes two illustrations of 'pedantry refusing to conform to idiom'. 'These (he says) will explain the occasion of many of the accents, with which I have thought it necessary to disfigure my text; for a good number of them will be found to be common enclitics. The rest are all put as guides to the dramatic rhythm, and many of them to ensure the usual pronunciation of words in verses the rhythm of which depends on it, but which I found some readers stumble at, so that they would rather mispronounce the word than accept the intended rhythm' (*Poetical Works of Robert Bridges*, vi (1905), 281-2).

¹ Professor A. W. Pollard has said the same thing: 'Barclay's verse steadily improved' (*The Castell of Labour*, Roxburghe Club ed., 1905, p. xl). This statement is indeed more comprehensive than mine, for it would include the judgement that the *Ship* marks a metrical advance upon the *Castell*. This is undoubtedly true—if Barclay did write the *Castell*. But the balance of opinion is at present against Professor Pollard: while he believes that 'there is no reason to doubt' the correctness of Bale's attribution of authorship (p. xxxvii), Miss White says 'there is a good deal of reason to doubt' it (*op. cit.*, p. x). As for the metrical side of the question, consideration of the *Castell* gives us the following facts about its author:

(1) He was interested in imitating the rime schemes of the French.

(a) While the long twelve-line stanza of the original prologue is not reproduced (the Troilus rime scheme being used instead) one stanza of this form is thrown in in the body of the work (ll. 1213-24).

(b) The octave stanza is used for the main part both in the French and in the English version.

(c) After 124 stanzas (992 lines) we find in the *Castell* four five-line stanzas riming -on, x, x, -on, -on, the last line of each being a refrain. These correspond to four similar stanzas in the French riming -son, -eur, -eur, -son, -son. (In two stanzas of the English the -eur rimes of the French are reproduced, once by -our, once by -ure.)

(d) The nine stanzas with Troilus rime scheme at ll. 2273-335 correspond to seven stanzas of the same form in the *Chasteau*.

(e) The four four-line stanzas concluding the French (which contain an acrostic on the author's name and the date) are not reproduced, their place being taken by four original octave stanzas. (This exception to the usual fidelity of reproduction may be due to one or all of these reasons: that it was beyond the translator's ingenuity to make a similar acrostic on his own name (he shirked using the difficult ten-line stanza for the prologue), that he did not want to reveal his own identity, or that he felt that he could not well fit in both a conclusion of the original form and one excusing the rudeness of his translation, which last was of course indispensable.)

(2) He was sensitive to the rhythms of the text he was translating.

(a) The choice of line movement in the English prologue corresponds to the use of the decasyllable in the French prologue.

(b) In the opening stanzas of the rendering of the main part of the work (stanzas 1-5, 7 and 8) the verse is the same as that of the prologue, but after stanza 8 it abruptly becomes four-stress, and in this metre the translation continues thence to the end. Here the lines are usually octosyllabic, often headless, frequently with one trisyllabic foot, practically never with more than two. The rendering of the English version is usually extremely close, and it often retains the rime word of the original. In these circumstances it seems that the effort required to turn French octosyllables into English heroics was too great for the translator to keep up, and he early abandoned the attempt.

(c) As in the last four lines of the *Chasteau*, the longer line reappears in the concluding stanzas.

(3) Even with the rhythm of the French decasyllable before him, he could not—or at any rate did not—write consistent English heroics.

There are in the *Castell* only three passages in which the heroic rhythm obviously predominates—the prologue, the excusation and seven of the first eight stanzas in the body of

Thus it appears that though Barclay had not the creative faculty necessary for the development of an artistically flexible verse form nor yet the critical power necessary for effecting a complete overhaul and founding a school,¹ he was, nevertheless, possessed of an ear for verse which led him instinctively to write lines which correspond metrically amongst themselves, and that accordingly, far from being regarded as an arch-representative of post-Chaucerian anarchy, he must rather be acknowledged as a man who systematized the chaos as it were from within and, in the *Eclogues*, set limits to the old trisyllabic excess.

This in turn involves some modification of the prevailing view that the early sixteenth century is the nadir of English metrical lawlessness.

the work. These comprise but 165 lines in all. Of these I read as many as 50 as four-beat, though about half of this number may also be read as headless or waistless heroics. The remaining 115 are heroics, of which 34 (29.6 per cent of them) are equivalented, lines with epic caesura (14) and with a single trisyllabic foot (13) accounting for the majority of these last. The writer was plainly far more at home with (somewhat equivalented) octosyllables, though even amongst them (ll. 65–2335) he slips in a few stray heroics, e.g. ll. 276, 341, 401, 403, 406, 410, 413, 529–33, 1706, 1708, 1709, 1711, 1745, and the complete stanza 2177–84.

Judging by these facts, we should expect the author of the *Castell* to write the *Ship* in four-beat lines, not consistent equivalenced heroics, and to follow closely the octosyllabic couplets of the German or of the French version rather than to base a free translation upon Latin elegiacs. At the same time it must be borne in mind that Barclay possessed the same kind of interest in externalities of form as we have noted in the translator of the *Chateau*. In the *Ship* he habitually gives the Envoyis independent character by writing them in the octave stanza; on three occasions he links successive stanzas with a refrain line (once the refrain is French) (I, 266-8; I, 268-70; II, 164-5); twice he introduces a ballade (without lenvoy) (II, 16-17; II, 284-5); once he employs internal rime throughout a sustained passage (II, 290-2). And in the fourth Eclogue each new stanza of the two stanzaic insertions (II, 759-90, 823-1134) starts with the rime of the line before. Another point too is worthy of note: the rhythm of the four-accent passage in the *Ship* (II, 317-21)—16 octave stanzas—is quite like that of the *Castell*. But Barclay was not the only man who imitated French verse forms and could write equivalenced octosyllables!

If, however, Barclay did write the *Castell*, then his feeling for the rhythm of the (equivalenced) heroic underwent very notable development between that work and the *Ship*, and, further, he acquired a greater taste for equivalence than is evinced in the first translation. That is, with a better grasp of the metre came an increased capacity for freedom within it.

¹ The metre of the *Eclogues* is a 'sport' in English metrical evolution, and appears to have attracted no imitators. Compare however the heavily alliterated verses (usually taken as four-accent) occurring in Tottel's 'Miscellany' (No. 220) and commencing thus:

Cruell | and vnkind || whom mercy cannot moue,
Herbour | of vnhappy || where rigours rage doth raigne,
The ground | of my grieffe || where pittie cannot proue:
To tickle to trust || of all vntruth the traine,
Thou rigorous rooke || that ruth cannot remoue.
Daungerous delph || depe dungeon of | disdaine;
The sacke | of self will || the chest of craft and change.
What causeth thus || so causes for | to change.

Here it is the line with one trisyllabic foot that largely predominates.

There is, on the one hand, Hawes, too much concerned with tradition, too consciously a member of the fifteenth-century Chaucer-Gower-Lydgate cult for us reasonably to expect much in the way of regular versification from him; yet as a matter of fact there is a greater proportion of impeccable ten-syllabled heroics in the *Pastime of Pleasure* than in perhaps any other poem written in the conventional 'mingled' mode. Then, on the other hand, there is Skelton, too virile and wayward a spirit, too impatient of restraint, to contain himself for long within the bounds of form; yet without a shadow of doubt he had an ear, if not for variation within a standard pattern, at least for energetic and artistically appropriate rhythms. And between the two there is Barclay, conservative like Hawes, but critical of abuses, not acquiescent and complacent; up-to-date like Skelton, but with a more even temperament: his clerical yet vigorously alive personality found final expression in a medium which while retaining the syllabic elasticity of the past placed it within bounds. Looked at from this point of view the last of the 'Chaucerians' are not so bad after all.

FITZROY PYLE.

DUBLIN.

'DEOR': A CRITICISM AND AN INTERPRETATION

We þæt Mæðhilde	monge gefrugnon
wurdon grundlease	Geates frige,
þæt hi seo sorglufu	slæp ealle binom.
þæs ofereode;	þisses swa mæg.

ALL that we know about Mæðhild and Geat occurs in the above quotation from *Deor*, ll. 14–16, and since the refrain is added in l. 17 which is also used in connexion with the misfortunes of Welund, Beadohild, Theodoric, and the people of Ermanaric, we may conclude that the troubles of Mæðhild and Geat proved a temporary difficulty rather than a final calamity. Further than that we cannot go with safety, especially as the passage cannot be interpreted entirely satisfactorily. Indeed, we cannot even be certain of the woman's name, since the manuscript reads *mæð hilde*, though the restoration seems as assured as these conjectural matters can well be. There have been many attempts at identification, and so far none has proved acceptable. Nor is it of very great importance that the puzzle should be solved. It would be satisfactory to know who these two people were and what was the nature of their particular trouble. A solution would enable us to add another outline of a story to our meagre Germanic store. But it is unlikely that the story, if known, would teach us anything new about the type of plot and treatment current at the time of the composition of *Deor*. A solution would satisfy our natural curiosity, and probably little else.

The latest attempt to solve the problem is that of Prof. Kemp Malone,¹ and it needs careful discussion since the conclusions, if they could be substantiated, would be of general interest. Prof. Malone draws on modern Scandinavian ballad tradition, finds a ballad which he proves to be connected with the lines in *Deor*, postulates as the time for the composition of *Deor* 'hardly . . . much later than about 950', and ends up with the statement that a Scandinavian ballad reached England by the middle of the tenth century. It is this last statement which is most disturbing. Terms like 'epic', 'lay', and 'ballad' have been tolerably well clarified, and if we are now to assume ballads in the tenth century this is a matter of some concern to all European vernacular literatures. Even Prof. Malone seems somewhat alarmed, and his alarm is given as one of the reasons why he favours as late a date as possible for the composition of *Deor*. The specific interpretation of *Deor*, ll. 14–16, and the connexion of the text as interpreted by Prof. Malone with later Scandinavian ballads

¹ 'Mæðhild', *English Literary History*, III, 253–6.

will have to be argued in some detail in order that we may know exactly how much evidence is adduced for ballads in the tenth century.

There is a Norwegian ballad¹ called 'Gaute og Magnild' in which the fair maiden Magnild is in tears when about to be wedded to a young man named Gaute. She fears death in the Vending river. Gaute promises to build a high and strong bridge; Magnild is not comforted. On the way home they see a deer. The whole company, except Magnild, follow it. When they return they find that the lady has disappeared in the water. Gaute calls for his harp and he plays on it so strongly that his bride, with her saddle and her horse, rises from the waves despite the 'contrary' magic of the water-demon. There is a corresponding Icelandic ballad² called either 'Gauta kvæði' or 'Kvæði af Gauta og Magnhildi'. This ballad is similar in structure but in the opening scene Gauti and Magnhild are in bed together, and Magnhild is sad. Some of the details of the breaking of the harp-strings are clearly later accretions, and well-known retarding devices. Here Gauti also rescues his wife but she is dead when she rises from the waves.

This ballad is known over a wide area. Many references are given in the discussion of the Danish 'Harpens Kraft',³ and there is a considerable amount of evidence to suggest that in many of the earlier versions of this story the name of the hero was not Gaute. Similarly, the woman is frequently unnamed, occurring merely as the 'bride' or the 'maiden', and sometimes she bears names other than Magnild. This evidence is dismissed all too lightly by Prof. Malone. Confining our attention only to the western Scandinavian versions we find Gullmund, Guldbrand, Peder, Wellemand and Tostein; the woman, where she is named at all, occurs as Magdelin and Signelin. Magnild is rare, and in one Norwegian version it is coupled with Tostein, so that the names are not even stable as a pair. In fact, the names Gauta and Magnild are so rare that one might imagine the naming to have taken place subsequent to the first edition of *Deor* in 1826. However, Grundtvig assures us that some of the Icelandic versions go back to the seventeenth century.⁴

Now even if we accept, in spite of all these preliminary difficulties, the

¹ M. B. Landstad, *Norske Folkeviser*, No. 51, pp. 469-76. Cf. also p. xiv.

² Svend Grundtvig og Jón Sigurðsson, *Íslenskt fornkvæði*, I (1854), No. 3, pp. 15-21 (*Nordiske Oldskrifter udgivne af det nordiske Literatur-Samfund*, XIX).

³ Svend Grundtvig, *Danmarks Gamle Folkeviser*, II (1856), No. 40, pp. 63-72. Cf. also F. J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, II (1886), pp. 137 ff. Child mentions much comparative material in the discussion of the ballad *Glasgerion*, and there are many references in Grundtvig's work. The possible connexion with or parallel development of the classical *Orpheus-Eurydice* story is dealt with by Grundtvig, *D.G.F.*, III (1862), 821 f.

⁴ Svend Grundtvig, *D.G.F.*, II, 64: 'Paa islandzk haves fire Opskrifter af Visen, alle fra 17de Aarh....'

names Gauta and Magnild as the original names we are not much further unless we can interpret the Old English text in such a way that it will fit in with the ballads.¹ Used carefully, the Northern parallels would then tell us two things. They would inform us that there was a pair Gauta and Magnild which was known to ballad tradition. That such a pair once existed is already proved by the *Deor* reference and, for the moment, the Scandinavian accounts prove nothing but the persistence of the names. The ballad tradition would further seem to make it probable that Geat was a Scandinavian. Geat occurs, of course, in the Old English genealogies but the Geat of *Deor* may well have been a Scandinavian. There is ample evidence for the early infiltration of Scandinavian story material into English in *Beowulf*. But even if we accept the Scandinavian names as the original ones and accept further that they correspond to those found in England that does not mean that there need necessarily be the remotest resemblance between the two stories. Famous names become common property, especially in ballad tradition, and it is superfluous to give a list of examples where names have survived and have been connected with stories of totally different origin and import. Any further valid evidence would have to come from the earliest account known to us, that in *Deor*.

If the lines in *Deor* showed some context which was readily identifiable with the modern accounts there would be a case. We do not know precisely what the lines do mean, and Prof. Malone resorts to the dangerous expedient of emending the text (*monge*) and straining the meaning (*frige*). Having thus prepared a suitable text he discovers that it fits in with some of the details of the Scandinavian ballads.

monge gefrugnon. The *ge* of *monge* is explained away as dittography, and the resulting *mon* is emended to *māne*. F. Klaeber² had already put forward *mān* but rejected it in favour of *mōd* on account of the difficult sense. Prof. Malone states: 'Alongside the familiar *mān* "crime, wickedness" another *mān* "complaint, lament" must have existed in Old English; it does not find record (apart from *Deor*) until M.E. times, but we must presume its existence in the earlier period as well, since otherwise M.E. *man*, *mon* (whence N.E. *moan*) would be inexplicable, as would also the O.E. denominative verb *mānan* "bewail".' The authority of F. Holthausen is then cited who records *mān* with the sense 'complaint, lament' in his *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Unfortunately,

¹ We may note in passing that the first elements of the names of the woman in Scandinavian sources and in Old English are not strictly parallel. This would not matter if the other evidence were good.

² *Anglia Beiblatt*, xvii, 284, note 1 and *Anglia*, I, 121, note 1.

however, with an asterisk! The earliest reference known to the *New English Dictionary* is from about the year 1225 (*Ancren Riwle*). It is possible that the word did exist in Old English but we cannot assume it, especially not when far-reaching literary conclusions are based on this postulated word. And even if we grant that *mān* may have existed in the required sense in Old English, how does it come about that we never meet with it in literature? A considerable amount of Old English verse is preserved, and in this verse there are frequent passages of complaint and lamentation. Parallelism and variation, as practised in Germanic alliterative poetry, demanded a fair stock of synonyms, and if we do not meet with *mān* 'complaint, lament' we may be sure that the poets did not consider it a suitable literary expression. Phonetic identity with *mān* 'wickedness' may have been the reason. This occurs often.¹ There is thus no reason whatever why we should accept either *mān* or the sense ascribed to it. Prof. Malone tells us: 'The English poet alludes to the opening scene (as recorded in the Icelandic), in which the lady lies abed, but laments instead of sleeping.'

There is another difficulty about this emendation. *Deor* is said to be composed not later than 950, the *Exeter Book* which preserves the poem for us may be as early as 970, and is unlikely to be much later, and within this short time we have to believe in an original *māne gefrugnon*, then *mange gefrugnon*, finally *monge gefrugnon*. It is difficult to credit that the English of the tenth century were so addicted to copying out secular verse. According to Prof. Malone, *māne gefrugnon* was the version when it left the poet's hands. Now we know that some of the longer poems were written, but have we any right to imagine the poet of *Deor*, quill in hand, thinking out his Germanic allusions?

Geates frige. *frige* is interpreted as being a gen. sing. of *fréo* 'lady', and the whole phrase is then taken to be a variation of *Mæðhilde*: 'the lamentations of Mæðhild, the lady of Geat.' There is a stylistic difficulty, to begin with. *Mæðhilde* occurs in line 14 *a*, *Geates frige* in line 15 *b*. Variation of this type is more usual either with a *b*-line and the immediately following *a*-line, or within the same long line or in two consecutive *a*- or *b*-lines.² Bosworth-Toller records only one instance of *fréo* in Old

¹ There are three references in *Beowulf* (110, 978, 1055). In Bosworth-Toller we find over thirty compounds with *mān* 'wickedness' as the first element. This sufficiently attests the wide distribution.

² Walther Paetzel, 'Die Variationen in der altgermanischen Alliterationspoesie', *Palaestra*, 48 (1913), discusses the evidence on this point on pp. 175 ff. Statistics for Old English and Old Saxon poems are given on p. 177. *Beowulf* has 63.3 per cent for a *b*-line followed immediately by an *a*-line, 18 per cent for variation in two consecutive *a*-lines, 7 per cent for variation in two consecutive *b*-lines, and less than 1 per cent for variation in an *a*-line and the *b*-line of the next verse. Taking *Beowulf* as the norm, *Deor* would have to

English (*Genesis* 457). The word is described as indeclinable though it is difficult to know how this was discovered since the only reference is an *acc. sing.* Anyhow, it is referred to the Old Saxon *fri* 'woman' since it occurs in a part of the poem that is known to have been translated from Old Saxon. The evidence for an Old English *fréo* 'woman' is therefore poor, and the evidence for a *gen. sing.* '*frige*' is poorer still.

Neither interpretation being satisfactory the whole case tumbles to the ground. Nothing new has been adduced to support a tenth-century dating for *Deor*, and there is still less to be said for ballads at this time. We are, nevertheless, grateful for the Scandinavian parallel which may prove that Geat and Mæðhild were so well known that some sort of memory was preserved over hundreds of years.

Interpretation of the passage may not be quite so hopeless as it seems if we confine our attention to the poem itself and see what it can teach us. Earlier attempts have often suffered from the romantic delusions of scholars who usually insisted on finding a pair of star-crossed lovers in the poem.¹ There is scant material for such conclusions. Leaving Mæðhild and Geat out of it for the moment we have four heroic references and one fictitious contemporary one. We are told of five cases in which adversity befell that was temporary, and in which some sort of gain resulted ultimately. Trouble overtook Welund, Beadohild, Theodoric the Ostrogoth, 'many a warrior' (*secg monig*) among the Goths, Deor himself. In the fourth case we are dealing with the warriors in general, not with a representative individual. For each of these five there is the opposite 'villain', to use a modern term, though not in the strictly villainous sense associated with the word nowadays. Welund is opposed by Niðhad, Beadohild also by Niðhad though this is not directly expressed. There can, however, be no doubt that she fears her father's wrath when he shall have discovered both her condition and who is responsible for it. Theodoric's evil enemy is Ermanaric. This again is not stated but there was no need to tell a Germanic audience why Theodoric had to spend thirty

be more than twice as long to show one example. There is a possible example in *Deor* in 5a *hine*, 6b *syllan monn*. This example shows the weakness of Paetzel's work which is far too mechanical. The length that would separate variations must clearly depend on whether they are self-explanatory or not. Thus he postulates a special type in which the variation is far removed from the first introduction. As an example he gives *Elene* 772b *wealdend engla*, 776a *ƿeoden engla*. In this example no ambiguity is possible, and it does not really matter how far they are removed from one another. It is, however, clear that the usage demanded by Professor Malone's interpretation is sufficiently rare to make the new translation highly suspect on stylistic grounds alone.

¹ References to earlier attempts will be found in Kemp Malone, *Deor*, 1933, pp. 8 and 31 (Bibliography). They are discussed in more detail by R. Imelmann, *Forschungen zur altenglischen Poesie*, 1920, pp. 470-85.

years at *Mæringa burg*. The enemy of 'many a warrior' is Ermanaric, and the opponent of Deor himself the song-famed Heorrenda. This being so it would seem that Mæðhild and Geat must be opponents, or that at least one of them must object to the attentions of the other. It is most satisfactory to assume that Geat was the persecutor, and it may be possible to discover a little more if we consider the structure of the poem. The poet intended to give examples of people who had ultimately triumphed in spite of initial calamity, and he chose these examples from among people who were, for a time, cruelly treated by fate. Welund, the lamed smith, was the first. His triumph was achieved largely at the discomfiture of the wholly innocent Beadohild who thus, quite naturally, became the second example. Beadohild's misfortune came to a good end: she bore Widia. The wronged Beadohild reminded the poet of the wronged Mæðhild. Her trouble was caused by Geat who, as I shall suggest, was presumably exiled¹ or went with Mæðhild into self-imposed exile. This called forth a reference to the most famous exile story in Germanic antiquity, that connected with Theodoric the Ostrogoth. His opponent was Ermanaric, and that led on naturally to a general consideration of the Gothic tyrant. There follows a passage (ll. 28-34) which commentators have often looked upon as a later Christian interpolation. In this passage the poet reflects that many a man sits bereft of joy conscious that life is full of care and troubles. Whoever thinks so should remember that God rules over this world, grants honour and glory to many a man, to others nothing but woe and misery. At first sight this does not seem to fit in with the other heroic contexts but there is nevertheless a close connexion. Ermanaric, in heroic tradition, became the inscrutable father figure. He dispensed gifts munificently and capriciously, and at the same time he acted with inexplicable treachery. His warriors are depicted by the poet as living under a cloud. These reflexions called forth in the mind of the poet the heavenly father figure whose actions, from the point of view of man, are just as inexplicable, and whose designs are just as inscrutable. Thus the whole scheme as it came into the poet's mind stands revealed and becomes intelligible. We are not dealing with a number of heroic references strung together like beads on a string but with a grand and simple structure carried through without a flaw by a consummate artist, as melancholy and civilized a figure as one is likely to meet in literature.²

In assuming that Mæðhild went into exile with Geat we are as yet

¹ I owe this suggestion to Dr A. H. Smith. It is the last link in the chain.

² After completing this article I have learned, in conversation with Prof. J. R. R. Tolkien, that he has for many years argued the cyclical construction of *Deor*. This is very welcome corroboration.

saying nothing of the nature of the wrong. The structure is, however, most readily intelligible if we allow that Mæðhild had cause to fear Geat and we must now look at the text to see if we can get any nearer to an interpretation.

Let us begin with *frige*. The word is plural and it is usually translated 'passion'. Bosworth-Toller gives two references only, both from *Crist*. We find: *sio weres friga wiht ne cuþe* (*Crist* 419) 'she knew nothing of the love of man', *sio* is the Virgin Mary. The other passage brings out the meaning still more clearly: *þæt wæs geworden butan weres frigum þæt þurh bearnes gebyrd bryd eacen wearð* 'that had come about without the love of man that the woman became pregnant in order to give birth to the child' (*Crist* 37). *frige*, therefore, as far as the evidence goes, refers to a man's love-passion; *weres frige* and *Geates frige* are strictly parallel, and it was Geat who was in a very real sense the persecutor. We can therefore accept the translation: 'Geat's passion grew boundless.' In the next line *hi* (a feasible *acc. sing. fem.*) is often either emended to *him* or it is taken to be an *acc. pl.* referring then to Mæðhild and Geat. This makes Mæðhild a willing participant, and will not do. *sorglufu* occurs only here but both elements are well attested. If we accept *slæpe* (*instr. sing.*) for the manuscript reading *slæp*, the normal interpretation, and understand that *sorglufu* portrays Mæðhild's feelings about Geat's *frige*, we may translate: 'so that this troublesome love deprived her of all sleep.' This is far preferable to the emendation *him* which makes Geat's feelings the subject of the line. Such a view leads back again to modern notions. We cannot credit that a Germanic hero lost his sleep because he was crossed in love and that ultimately he fought his way back to a serenity of mind either through achieving his love object or through the mere passage of time.

The first line is the most difficult on account of the odd syntax and the curious *monge*. It should not, as some commentators have done, be translated 'many', since such a meaning is too weak to bear the chief stress of the line. Nor will such a translation give very satisfactory sense. *monge* is the key-word of the whole passage, and here we are entirely in the dark. In his 1933 edition, Prof. Malone interpreted it as 'love commerce'. For this, there is no English evidence though the required sense is found in Icelandic. The word should, however, mean something of that sort, and it would perhaps be best if we took it in the general sense of 'affair'. Placing a colon after *gefrugnon*, the whole passage, without departing from the manuscript tradition except for accepting the usual *slæpe*, might then be freely rendered: 'We heard the following concerning Mæðhild's affair: Geat was completely overmastered by his love passion

so that this troublesome (and unrequited) affection caused great grief to her.'

By harping back for a moment to Beadohild a little more information can be gained. Beadohild was raped by Welund. Her sorrow was caused less by this than by the fear of eventual discovery. But in the end all was well: the son she bore became a famous hero. Now even if we cannot say what precisely happened in Mæðhild's 'affair' we can be certain that it would have differed from that of Beadohild. The poet would not have given the same story with different names. In Mæðhild's case the solution would then have lain in the removal of the unwanted lover. To an heroic poet removal under such circumstances meant death in battle.

One of the oldest of Germanic stories is that of Hagen, Hild and Heoden. We are able to reconstruct it with a great degree of certainty. Heoden eloped with Hild, the daughter of Hagen. The father pursued the fugitives, and in the subsequent fight the lover slew the father.¹ We are not going too far if we postulate: Geat eloped with the unwilling Mæðhild. For this he was exiled. During her sojourn with Geat Mæðhild suffered many indignities. Ultimately, someone from Mæðhild's clan arrived, Geat was slain in battle, and Mæðhild returned home with her rescuer.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

¹ The author of the Middle High German *Alexanderlied* (c. 1150) knew a poem in which 'Hild's father lay dead'. In *Kudrun* the plot has been shifted to Hild's daughter Kudrun, and the pursuing father is now Hettel (the Old English Heoden). There is a battle, and Hettel is slain by Ludwig, the father of the abductor Hartmuot. This was necessary as the poet wished to preserve Hartmuot's life at the end of the epic; he also disliked the idea of Hartmuot paying court to Kudrun after being the actual slayer of her father. Hartmuot is later on referred to once as the slayer of Hettel. H. Schneider, *Germanische Heldensage*, I (1928), p. 373, says: 'Hartmut ist Hettel's Mörder—das ist eine offensichtliche, einmalige Entgleisung.' Why should it be a momentary lapse? The history of the development of Germanic story material is to a large extent a careful analysis of such 'momentary lapses', and if Schneider wishes to operate with them merely for the sake of proving his untenable theory that *Kudrun* is essentially a late mediæval creation, most of the content of his three volumes on Germanic Heroic Story could be scrapped forthwith.

A POET IN CHANCERY: EDWARD BENLOWES

IN expatiating on the joys of a life of retirement, Edward Benlowes finds that a man who will improve his state by the cultivation of his mind is careful, among other things, to shun 'Prolixer Law-suits'.¹ It is one of the several ironies of circumstance which the biography of this poet exhibits that Benlowes was subsequently to be involved in prolonged litigation. The Chancery records of this litigation are of considerable interest and throw light on a period of Benlowes' life of which hitherto very little has been known. They are also the fullest evidence that we have, outside his published work, of the poet's character. Studious, retiring, essentially kind-hearted, with none of the world's cunning, he was easily imposed on in matters of business. He was too generous, but also too weak, to drive hard bargains; yet, like many another weak-willed man, he could occasionally display the most stubborn and illogical obstinacy, compensating for a lack of assertiveness by an unwavering passive resistance.

Benlowes was concerned in two long legal squabbles—one against Nathan Wright, the purchaser of his estates, and Benjamin Wright, his son; the other against his own manservant, John Schoren. He first appears in Chancery in 1657, but the causes of the trouble go back many years.

Benlowes belonged to the landed gentry; he had inherited estates in Finchingfield and Great Bardfield and the surrounding part of Essex worth over a thousand pounds a year. Following the traditions of his family, he was educated at Cambridge and Lincoln's Inn. Subsequently he spent some years in foreign travel. It was while he was travelling on the Continent round about 1630 that he first met Schoren, a Dutchman and a printer, in Brussels; and he was led to engage him as his servant. Schoren's story is that he was inveigled from his trade by Benlowes' fair promises; but Schoren is always plaintive, and from what one gathers of the subsequent relations of master and man, it seems possible that the persuasion was on Schoren's side. But Benlowes certainly found Schoren useful for his knowledge of languages, and they travelled together for two years. Benlowes then became dangerously ill with smallpox in Venice, and Schoren claims that his care and industry were largely responsible for his master's recovery. Benlowes was duly grateful and took Schoren

¹ *Theophila*, XIII, stanza 17.

back with him to Brent Hall, his house in Essex, where, reposing fullest confidence in him, he made him his bailiff. Schoren collected the rents of the estate and had charge of all buying and selling.

At some time Benlowes was moved to settle upon Schoren an annuity of twenty marks (£13. 6s. 8d.), a grant which was to be the cause of much trouble later on. Twenty marks a year was the amount of Schoren's wages, but this sum seems first to have been secured to him by an annuity about 1635. The reasons and conditions upon which the annuity was given are fiercely contested. Benlowes says that he was inspired merely by charity, but Schoren indignantly denies this, claiming that the annuity was a just reward for his faithful service and that Benlowes was merely fulfilling promises to requite him for his good works. It is clear, however, that the annuity was granted after some importunity from Schoren, and that Benlowes at length acceded to Schoren's request from his great joy at Schoren's conversion to Protestantism.

Upon his return from abroad Benlowes had forsaken the traditional Catholicism of his family to become an ardent Protestant. The proselytizing fervour which afterwards marked him made Schoren its first object. Benlowes 'did earnestly solicit and much importune him', and took great pains in instructing him in Protestant doctrine. Eventually he succeeded—if not in converting Schoren, at least in bribing him. Schoren allowed himself to be convinced 'outwardly' after he had received from Benlowes several good sums of money and the promise of the annuity. Benlowes, in the simplicity of his mind and his eagerness to get a convert, and with unbounded confidence in Schoren, seems not to have doubted his sincerity. According to Benlowes himself the annuity was only payable as long as Schoren conformed to the doctrines of the Church of England, though Schoren denies that this proviso was ever made. But at any rate Schoren was a good Protestant for a time. Benlowes, however, habitually easy-going in money matters, seems to have allowed the annuity to fall into arrears. With negligence on his side and grasping dishonesty on Schoren's, there was ample scope for future disputes.

By about 1641 Benlowes' debt to Schoren, for wages and for money lent, seems to have amounted to a considerable sum,¹ and on 17 January 1641/2, if Schoren is to be believed, Benlowes gave his bond for £84. 18s. Shortly afterwards Schoren absconded with some of Benlowes' moneys. The annuity then lapsed and Benlowes held himself, in consequence of Schoren's embezzlement, absolved from all claims upon him. That, I

¹ Schoren puts it at about £120. But subsequently he talks of a debt of £50, while the amount guaranteed by the bond was only £44. 18s.

think, is the explanation of his repudiation of his debt to Schoren and of his assertion that Schoren, as the collector of his rents, had had ample opportunity to pay himself, and in fact had paid himself, all that was owing to him. And it also seems to explain why Schoren afterwards dated the bond much later, making it appear that it was given him after, not before, he absconded.

About 1644 or 1645¹ Schoren reappeared at Brent Hall and begged to be allowed to re-enter Benlowes' service. He was then in great poverty and Benlowes, in re-engaging him, was partly moved by pity. But he was glad also to have the protection of Schoren in the troubled times of civil war and to have someone who would take charge of his household affairs and relieve the cares of his bachelor existence. Schoren was now married, and, with a panegyric on his wife's abilities as a housekeeper, he persuaded Benlowes to engage her too. The two of them were therefore installed at Brent Hall, and Benlowes, trustful as ever, allowed Schoren full control of his estates. Schoren was also useful, through his skill as a printer, in Benlowes' artistic pursuits. He helped in painting and gilding and with the rolling press that was used to take copies of engravings. In 1646 Benlowes, by means of an indenture, renewed Schoren's annuity.

Benlowes, a staunch supporter of the King in a county strongly Round-head, was at this time in some fear of the depredations of the Parliamentary troops. On one occasion he entrusted to Schoren's keeping the sum of £30. This was never repaid. Schoren claimed that £17 of it had been stolen out of his chamber window by a carpenter who lodged in the house. Benlowes seems to have believed this tale at first, but afterwards he thought that Schoren had himself appropriated the money. Later on Benlowes and Schoren both took an active part in the Civil War, and during this time Benlowes again neglected the payment of the annuity.

With the Parliament's formidable demands in taxation and with the subsequent decimation of Benlowes' estates as a penalty for his delinquency in supporting the King, the Civil War was a severe drain on Benlowes' finances. A further calamity befell him in 1653, when Brent Hall was burnt down. Left without a country residence, he went to live for a time in London. A few things had been saved from the fire, including household goods, corn, cattle, and a 'brass blunderbuss of good value'. Schoren was commissioned to sell these and Benlowes asserted that they realized over £100; but Schoren never produced any particulars

¹ The dates of many incidents are confused. The litigants not only contradict one another, but sometimes contradict themselves. In his bill of 1662 Benlowes says nothing of having employed Schoren twice, but telescopes the two series of events into one.

of the sale and Benlowes received none of the money. Schoren himself had lost all his personal effects in the fire and with them the deed of his annuity. But Benlowes confirmed the annuity and gave his bond for £200, dated 6 April 1655, vouching for its payment. According to Benlowes there was also an oral agreement that all previous debts between himself and Schoren should be cancelled.

At this time Benlowes was involved in financial transactions of much more consequence than his dealings with Schoren: he was engaged first in mortgaging and then in selling his whole family estates. His reputation for lavish generosity was undoubtedly well-founded, and the elaborate and expensive production of his *Theophila* in 1652, when he was already getting into financial straits, bears some testimony to the careless ease with which he spent money. But the chief cause of his financial distress must have been the Civil War, with the burning down of his country house as an unpleasant aggravation of his difficulties. By 1654 he had debts approaching £3000. In this year a marriage was arranged between his niece Philippa and Walter Blount of Mapledurham, and it fell to Benlowes to provide her marriage portion. This he did with characteristic liberality in a sum of £6000. In order to raise it and to pay off his debts he borrowed £9000 from Robert Abdy and William Meggs, mortgaging to them the whole of his Essex estates.¹ Benlowes' brothers were all dead and there was no possibility of keeping the estates in the Benlowes' name; so shortly afterwards, in order 'to take off that heavie burthen of interest and Taxes w^{ch} eate vpp neere vppon the whole rent', he decided on absolute sale, and was brought into touch with Nathan Wright, of London. He had to borrow £500 from Wright to pay off interest on the mortgage before he could get the title-deeds of the estates for Wright's inspection, but on 3 March 1655/6, the mortgage was transferred to Wright² as a preliminary to his buying the estates outright. He was to view the premises and approve the purchase by 20 April, and was to pay eighteen times the annual rental of the estates.

So far the transaction was going well, and Benlowes determined to make the best bargain he could. He realized that many of his lands were underrented and he sought therefore to make leases more favourable to himself in order to increase the purchase price. Samuel Benham, of Grays' Inn, who acted for him in this affair, was down at Brent Hall two months on end, and eventually the rents were raised in all by £100 a year. But the business was evidently mismanaged, for before the new leases

¹ Close Rolls, 1654, Part ix (16). See also a fine, Common Pleas, 25 (2)/550 A.

² Close Rolls, 1655, Part xxiv (13).

could be signed the tenants got to know that the estates were about to change hands, and, apparently not enjoying the prospect of Wright as a landlord, withdrew from their contracts. Benlowes accused Wright of hardness and threats; he was certainly a shrewd man of business, with whom Benlowes was bound to get the worse of any bargain. Having frightened the tenants out of their contracts, Wright had an excellent excuse for disapproving of the purchase, and proceeded to avail himself of it. Benlowes was now in an awkward situation. He had got his estates 'soe secured and intangled' to Wright that to attempt to find another purchaser was out of the question, and the interest on the mortgage was rapidly mounting up. So he had to make concessions. He agreed to admit the old scale of rents as the basis of the valuation, and to accept, for everything save one farm, seventeen instead of eighteen times the annual value. His assiduous efforts to increase the rental of the estates had therefore done much more harm than good.

It was not until 11 May 1657 that the necessary indentures were signed. The purchase price had then been fixed at £15,315. But the matter was by no means settled, for the estates were heavily encumbered and the two could not agree on the amount of compensation which should be allowed. It was extremely difficult to get Benlowes to give any satisfactory account of the encumbrances: finding Wright a grasping customer, he was already adopting a policy of obstruction. Wright made various appointments with Benlowes at the chambers of Edward Harries (or Herries) in Lincoln's Inn, but each time Benlowes either failed to appear or else postponed making any lucid statement. Accordingly Wright brought a suit in Chancery, asking that Benlowes should be made to give full details of all encumbrances still in existence. For the various charities imposed upon the estates by his famous ancestor, Sergeant William Benlowes, Benlowes offhandedly referred Wright to the Sergeant's will, but he made a full statement of the encumbrances which he himself had imposed. Some of these illustrate his generosity to his tenants. There was, for example, a farm worth about £7 a year which a certain John Harvey was to enjoy during his life at the yearly rent of one shilling and some 'foule'.

It took Benlowes seven months to put in his answer to Wright's bill, and there was then further dispute about the compensation to be allowed for the encumbrances now that these had once been stated. Dilapidations were also an important item; Benlowes insisted that repairs had already cost him 'a very good sum of money', while Wright alleged that the farms and houses were 'ruinous and in greate decay'. Wright paid over several sums of money, but before any settlement had been

reached, on 11 March 1657/8, he died. The dispute continued with his son Benjamin (afterwards Sir Benjamin), who inherited the estates, and who was even more reluctant to pay than his father had been.

One of the encumbrances was Schoren's annuity, which had been made chargeable on Benlowes' lands in the parish of Great Bardfield. Benjamin Wright was anxious that this should be once and for all removed. So Benlowes offered Schoren £100 in full settlement of his claims on the estate; but Schoren, urged on by his implacable wife, peremptorily turned down the proposal. He also began to get restive about the arrears of his annuity. He first sued Benlowes in an action entered in the Wood Street Counter upon the bond which Benlowes had given him as far back as 1642. On 15 December 1657, Benlowes was arrested at his lodgings in London—in St Paul's Churchyard, where he had gone to live after the sale of his estates—and was taken to the Mitre tavern in Wood Street. Instead of pleading that this debt had been wiped out by the oral agreement of 1655, he foolishly boasted to the sergeant's yeoman who attended him at the Mitre that he could please himself whether he paid Schoren or not, since he knew that Schoren could not produce the bond. Schoren alleged that he repeated this boast at a meeting in the chambers of Mr Harris¹ in Lincoln's Inn. Schoren did, however, produce a bond; but Benlowes promptly denounced it as a forgery. Schoren then abandoned his suit—tacitly, it would seem, admitting the forgery—but only to bring the matter into Chancery. He now claimed that the bond had been lost, and Benlowes thereupon denied that there had ever been a bond, ridiculing the accusation made by Schoren that he had got possession of it by a trick and wilfully destroyed it.

The case dragged on a long time and meanwhile Schoren's annuity led to further complications. It still had to be paid out of the estates and was paid by Benjamin Wright until 1660, when Wright suddenly stopped it. And Schoren had no more success than Benlowes in his attempts to extract money from him. It seems plain that Wright had made up his mind not to pay out anything at all until all claims upon the estate should be finally agreed.

Benlowes, kept waiting for his money, was also getting disgruntled. Ultimately he entered a bill in Chancery on 26 November 1661. He contended that Nathan Wright had obtained the estates for at least £5000 less than their true value; and even on 'the hard termes' upon which Wright had 'wrested' them from him there still remained over £3000 to

¹ No doubt the Edward Harries who had acted in the dispute between Benlowes and Nathan Wright in 1657.

pay.¹ And he contested Benjamin Wright's claim to deduct for repairs and encumbrances at 'his owne vnreasonable Termes'.

Benlowes' fortunes had indeed undergone a serious change in the last ten years. Having given Philippa her portion, having paid off his debts and satisfied the interest on loans and mortgages, he had now parted with his estates and had actually received into his own pocket less than £2000. And of this he had spent £500 to relieve the estates of an annuity he had granted to Elizabeth, widow of his brother William, and had also removed some smaller encumbrances. And he had then the additional satisfaction of finding that even lands which he had intended to keep for himself when the rest of the estate was sold were being held by Wright, who was unjustly receiving from them rents of £37 a year. With no rents now coming in, his principal assets at this time seem to have been his claims on Wright and his expectation of the gratitude of his niece and her husband.

It was not until fifteen months after Benlowes had entered his suit that Wright put in his answer. The matter was then referred to arbitrators, who on 5 June 1663 awarded Benlowes £990. That represents a fairly liberal deduction for the encumbrances; but, even so, Wright placed every possible obstacle in Benlowes' way and only £290 was paid. Things were further complicated by some new debts contracted by Benlowes. He owed £166 to Thomas Colwell and £171 to Edward Nash, who joined in suing him in the Lord Mayor's Court in London on 5 December 1663.² Benlowes seems by now to have adopted a stubborn policy of paying nothing to any one until forced. Colwell and Nash complained that he 'had & did obscure and abscond his person and Concealed his Estate' so that they 'could not in any wise speake with him...or take any legall course against him or his Estate'. Despairing of ever getting anything from Benlowes, they sought to get satisfaction from Wright, out of the £700 which Wright still owed Benlowes. But Benlowes was at the same time attempting to recover the full £700 himself, and Wright, assailed on both sides, sought relief in Chancery in May 1664.³

¹ The actual amount appears in Sir Benjamin Wright's bill of 1664. It was £3315.

² In spite of an exhaustive search among the extant files of the court I have been unable to trace any record of this case, and cannot therefore surmise what this debt may have been for.

³ He offered to pay Benlowes if he were granted an indemnity against Benlowes' creditors, and on 10 June 1664 he obtained an injunction staying the legal proceedings of Colwell and Nash. There for the moment the matter seems to have rested. But in 1666 Wright swears to having paid £690 of the sum awarded to Benlowes, and must therefore have paid out in the meantime another £400. This was the precise amount that Colwell and Nash were suing him for; so it looks as if their claim ultimately succeeded, while Benlowes again got nothing.

During all this time Schoren's Chancery suit made no progress; but Schoren himself was by no means quiescent. He sued Wright by a bill entered in Chancery on 28 May 1661, demanding the payment of his annuity, but he had to drop his proceedings through lack of funds. He could not produce the original deed securing the annuity upon the Great Bardfield property—it had been destroyed in the Brent Hall fire—and fell back therefore on his second security, the bond of £200 given him by Benlowes in 1655. He sought to recover the value of this bond by an action in the Court of Common Pleas in the Michaelmas term of 1662. Benlowes promptly brought a suit in Chancery (21 November 1662) to try and stop him. He acknowledged the bond of 1655, but insisted that Schoren had since then forfeited his claim to the annuity by reverting to Catholicism. Benlowes had continued to pay it nevertheless; for to what may have been a sense of duty towards Schoren and a susceptibility to Schoren's persuasions was added another motive—that of fear. Although his estates had been decimated because of his support of the King in the Civil War, he was afraid that further penalty might be exacted if Schoren informed against him. There is no evidence that Schoren attempted to blackmail him in this way, but all Schoren's dealings show him to have been quite unscrupulous, and Benlowes' fear at least suggests that there were threats.

Benlowes contended, then, that he was not bound to continue the annuity after Schoren's apostasy, and that in any case Schoren's first claim was upon the estates, which now belonged to Wright. The Court overruled these objections, but decreed that Benlowes' bond need not be forfeit if the annuity was paid up to date. Benlowes paid up and on 8 July 1663 obtained an injunction barring Schoren's action in the Common Pleas.

Benlowes was by this time quite disillusioned about Schoren and thoroughly hostile to him. Having succeeded in frustrating his activities in the Common Pleas, he determined to try and check him in Chancery too. He brought a second suit against him on 25 November 1663, contending that when he had confirmed Schoren's annuity with the £200 bond in 1655 their oral agreement had effectively annulled all outstanding debts. He sought therefore to stay Schoren's proceedings upon the bond of 1642. He also sued for the money which Schoren had obtained from selling the goods from the Brent Hall fire, but which had never been handed over. Earlier he had been anxious not to have recourse to law, but having been brought into the courts by Schoren, he decided to retaliate. Schoren, however, successfully pleaded the Statute of

Limitations; for it was now over six years after the sale of the goods for which Benlowes was seeking an account.

The rest of the dispute underwent a very tortuous journey through the courts, attended by many legal quibbles on both sides. The whole litigation is an excellent example of the law's delays and of the steadfast determination of the parties to obstruct each other as much as possible. Schoren's counsel had sought to discredit Benlowes' suit by submitting that his bill of complaint contained scandalous matter. He had also held that there was nothing for Schoren to answer beyond what had been answered to Benlowes' suit of the previous year, and had entered a plea and demurrer. This was dismissed, but had to be twice reheard because first one side and then the other was not represented in court. Eventually, on 12 May 1664, it was referred for decision to one of the Masters of the Court.

In spite of all his efforts, Benlowes was not successful in stopping Schoren's Chancery action. The case was argued in court on 17 June 1664, six years after Schoren had entered the suit. Benlowes had failed to prove that there had been an oral agreement in 1655 annulling previous debts, and Schoren's claim for the forfeiture of the bond for £84. 18s. obviously held good, therefore, if it could once be proved that the bond had ever existed. It was decided that this was not an issue for Chancery, the court of equity, and the case was dismissed. But Schoren appealed and got a rehearing after having paid Benlowes' costs. Again Chancery declined to judge the issue, but referred it to a court of common law. By now it was evidently thought that a little despatch would be advisable, and it was arranged that the case should come before the Lord Chief Justice Bridgman at his next sitting. After a long debate of counsel he gave his verdict in favour of Schoren, and Chancery then ordered Benlowes to pay the amount of the bond plus the costs of the case. Costs were assessed and a final award for the sum of £157. 0s. 6d. was made on 15 April 1665.

But the case was by no means ended. Whereas Benlowes had in his earlier dealings been weak and too susceptible to Schoren's importunity, he now became adamant, though hardly more business-like. Although Schoren had obtained his decree, Benlowes obstinately refused to pay. By now he had left London and had gone to live at Mapledurham with his niece Philippa and her husband.¹ In their house he did 'so abscond

¹ So, while it is certainly odd to find that Walter Blount made no provision for Benlowes in his will, Anthony à Wood's charges of ingratitude are not entirely just. Exactly when Benlowes went to live at Mapledurham cannot be ascertained. He could still describe himself as 'of London' in November 1663.

himself' that Sarah Schoren and others whom she employed were unable to serve him with copies of the Chancery orders. A writ of execution was followed by a proclamation, but Benlowes still made no attempt to pay, and on 9 February 1665/6 a subpoena was issued commanding him to appear in court. This also was ignored.

Schoren was now dead, but his wife pursued the case relentlessly. Despairing of ever getting money out of Benlowes, on 13 February she opened proceedings against Sir Benjamin Wright, whom she recklessly accused of conspiring with Benlowes to withhold the money from her. Wright, of course, could not be held liable for sums owed by Benlowes before 1657, when Nathan Wright bought the property; and he claimed that even after that the payment of the annuity was Benlowes' responsibility.¹ Wright, however, still had moneys belonging to Benlowes: of the £990 awarded to Benlowes by the Chancery court in 1663, £300 was still unpaid. Therefore, since Benlowes could not be got to pay, it was ordered on 21 May 1666 that Wright should pay Mrs Schoren out of this £300. But Benlowes persisted in thwarting Mrs Schoren to the utmost and was quick to intervene. On 4 July his counsel, Peck, showed that Benlowes had paid the annuity up to the time of Schoren's death and argued that the Court's award to Schoren of £157. 0s. 6d. was not chargeable upon Wright's lands, since it had nothing to do with the annuity, but was due upon Benlowes' personal bond given for arrears of wages. He therefore objected to the order allowing Mrs Schoren to be paid out of the money which Wright owed Benlowes, and the order was rescinded. But Benlowes was warned that, if he continued to show contempt of all the orders of the court, the £300 in Wright's hands would be sequestered in order to satisfy Mrs Schoren.

It may have been this further legal development which brought Benlowes to London, for he was seen in Whitefriars about 6 or 7 July. But he speedily went back to his seclusion at Mapledurham, and on 2 August, when Mrs Schoren attempted to serve him with a writ of execution, he refused to see her unless she would first promise that she had nothing against him. She knew that he was in the house, and 'he kept himselfe in a Roome the doore being made fast'. Her persistence eventually succeeded, but when on 7 August there was a further order of the Court she had no hope of repeating the achievement. Seeing that Benlowes 'doth very much secret himselfe in the said howse and is very hard to bee

¹ The position seems to have been that Benlowes had either to keep up the annuity himself or else pay Wright compensation for it; and although Wright had been allowed compensation, Benlowes subsequently preferred the other alternative, intending to recover from Wright the amount allowed in compensation.

spooken withall', the Master of the Rolls has to consent on 11 August for this new writ to be merely left at the house instead of being served on Benlowes in person. It was delivered on 19 August; but Benlowes still held out. On 6 October the Sheriff of Middlesex reported that an attachment with proclamation had had no effect. According to the usual procedure a Commission of Rebellion was next appointed and this also failed to lay hands on Benlowes. A sergeant-at-arms was then commanded to apprehend Benlowes so that he might answer his contempt of court; but the sergeant too had to confess on 16 November that Benlowes 'doth soe hide and abscond himselfe that he cannot be found'. The order was then given for the sequestration of Benlowes' personal estate.

Benlowes had succeeded in holding up the progress of the law for about six months. And that, no doubt, gave him considerable satisfaction. For he was undoubtedly convinced that Schoren, after his repeated dishonesty, had morally no claims upon him. But the ultimate result was the same. Out of the £300 which Sir Benjamin Wright still owed Benlowes, £157. 0s. 6d. was to be taken to pay Mrs Schoren according to the Chancery award, as well as £41 to satisfy her costs in the later stages of her legal proceedings. In addition, Wright was given leave to recoup himself for the expenditure to which he had been put. There can have been little left of the £300. What pleasure Benlowes had in opposing the Schorens to the end had to be dearly bought.

Benlowes' large fortune had now disappeared. The disposal of his estates had ultimately provided little beyond Philippa's portion. By 1661 the net receipts of Benlowes himself had been under £1500,¹ and since then he had received a mere £690, of which £400 was presumably taken by his creditors Colwell and Nash.² And his own expenses during ten years of litigation must have been very considerable. While his adventures in the law had not been of his own seeking, they undoubtedly resulted from a thorough mismanagement of his business dealings, even though one may feel that in the Wrights he met with rather cunning and exacting customers and that in Schoren he had a particularly unscrupulous servant. He allowed both Nathan Wright and Schoren to secure the better bargaining position, apparently without realizing the power he was giving them or ever dreaming that they would use it. He allowed Schoren to badger him into establishing an annuity upon him; and while Schoren was as astute as he was plausible in always obtaining a tangible security for every promise or obligation, Benlowes on his side seems to have been easily contented with a sort of gentleman's agree-

¹ Cf. above, p. 388.

² Cf. above, p. 388 n. 3.

ment. He allowed his estates to become so entangled that Nathan Wright could dictate his own terms of purchase, and he then parted with them before, instead of after, any agreement had been reached about the deductions to be made for encumbrances. Yet even the grossest mismanagement can hardly have merited Benlowes' unhappy fate. With the deaths of Philippa and Walter Blount he was left, pathetically enough, with little other than the consolation of his own maxims, so largely expressed in *Theophila*, upon the vanity of all worldly things. His sense of this vanity, his studies, his religion, were henceforth his only consolations until he died in 1676 in the most abject poverty.¹

HAROLD JENKINS.

JOHANNESBURG.

¹ The following are the relevant Chancery suits:

- (1) Collins 140/147. Nathan Wright v. Edward Benlowes, etc., 1657.
- (2) Whittington 71/87. John Schoren v. Edward Benlowes, 1658.
- (3) Bridges 629/64. John Schoren v. Benjamin Wright, 1661.
- (4) Bridges 444/123. Edward Benlowes v. Benjamin Wright, etc., 1661.
- (5) Reynardson 31/14. Edward Benlowes v. John Schoren, 1662.
- (6) Collins 28/11. Edward Benlowes v. John Schoren, etc., 1663.
- (7) Bridges 44/89. Benjamin Wright v. Edward Benlowes, etc., 1664.
- (8) Collins 28/75. Sarah Schoren v. Benjamin Wright, 1666.

There are depositions for Nos. 2 and 6. C 24/835, 896.

The following also relate to these actions:

Affidavits:

Trinity, 1663, Nos. 312, 454, 505.
 Michaelmas, 1663, Nos. 831, 832, 851.
 Hilary, 1664, Nos. 167, 770.
 Easter, 1665, No. 337.
 Easter, 1666, No. 552.
 Trinity, 1666, Nos. 833, 860, 861, 862.
 Easter, 1667, No. 256.

Decrees and Orders:

1660 B fol. 586.
 1661 A fol. 572.
 1662 A fols. 330, 623, 731, 856.
 1663 A fols. 169, 206, 274, 410, 421, 563,
 572, 721, 751.
 1663 B fols. 378, 431, 760, 874, 880, 882,
 883, 979.
 1664 B fols. 170, 215, 269, 270, 373, 473,
 570, 626.
 1665 B fols. 125, 222, 308, 316, 433, 561,
 609, 631.
 1666 B fols. 25, 53, 540, 689.

EX LIBRIS POLITIANI

II. INCUNABULA BODLEIANA

A COPY of the fourth edition of Pliny's *Historia naturalis*, annotated by Politian, is in the Bodleian.¹ This book belonged formerly to the family of the marchesi Niccolini of Florence, where Bandini, writing in 1762, remarked that he had seen it.²

On April 6, 1835, at the auction sale of Richard Heber's books, this copy of Pliny was sold for £17.³ On February 19, 1849, it was again offered for auction by Leigh Sotheby and Co., and is described at length in their *Catalogue of very fine, important and valuable books, selected from the library of an eminent literary character*,⁴ none other than G. Libri.⁵ At this sale, which Macray describes as 'extremely curious', the book was bought for the Bodleian library for £21.⁶

As Leigh Sotheby and Co. declared in their catalogue 'for a new edition of Pliny, this volume would be an invaluable treasure, as it offers a great number of new and excellent readings made in the XV century by Politianus from ancient manuscripts, now lost'. In fact in the second part of the inscription, which Politian wrote in 1490, at the end of the book, he states that he had collated it with three old codices, two of them from the library of St Mark at Florence, and the third belonging to King Ferrante of Naples, and formerly to Leonardo Arretino.⁷

¹ *C. Plinii Secundi, Naturalis historiae libri 37*, Romae, C. Sweynheym et A. Pannartz, 1473, fol., cum notis MSS. Politiani. (Auct. Q.1.2.) This edition is said to have been made from a copy of the 1470 edition, corrected by Niccolò Perotti, whose name however does not appear. The three earlier editions are: 1469, Venetiis, Joannes de Spira, fol. (ed. pr.); 1470, Romae, Sweynheym et Pannartz, fol.; 1472, Venetiis, Nicolaus Jenson, fol. (a reprint of the 1470 ed.). See G. W. Panzer, *Annales typographici*, 11 vols. (Norimbergae, 1793-1803), II, p. 437, T. F. Dibdin, *Bibliotheca Spencervana*, 4 vols. (London, 1814-15), II, pp. 260-1 and J. G. T. Graesse, *Trésor de livres rares et précieux ou Nouveau dictionnaire bibliographique*, 7 vols. (Dresde, 1859-69), V, pp. 337-8.

² A. M. Bandini, *Ragionamento istorico sopra le collazioni delle fiorentine pandette fatte da Angelo Poliziano* (Livorno, 1762), p. lxvi. There is a copy of this book in the B.M. (5255.aaa.54). See also A. Luzio and R. Kenier, 'Coltura e relazioni letterarie d' Isabella D' Este' in *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XXXIII (1899), pp. 1-62. On p. 14 there is a reference to the Pliny studied by Politian, which was mentioned in a letter of Lorenzo de' Medici (The Younger), October 5, 1501, and was then owned by a private person, see *Bibliofilo*, VII, 27.

³ *Bibliotheca Heberiana, Catalogue of the Library of the late Richard Heber Esq.*, 13 parts (London, 1834-7), part VI, p. 210, no. 2871. The copy which I have used (Mus. Bibl. III, 8°, 722-6) was presented to the Bodleian by Sir Henry Ellis and contains the following manuscript note by him: 'The Prices in black, through this Catalogue, are those which the Books brought at the time Mr Heber's library was sold, etc.'

⁴ A copy of this catalogue is in the Bodleian (Mus. Bibl. 3. 520, no. 17). The book in question is described on p. 64.

⁵ W. D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library Oxford*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1890), p. 351.

⁶ See also Bandini, *op. cit.*, p. lxvii, who copied out Politian's inscription and submitted it with additional notes to the marchese De la Torres Rezzonico, who was then at work on his *Esercitazioni Pliniane, or Disquisitiones Plinianae*. Politian's marginal notes and textual corrections are written throughout in black and red ink.

⁷ According to the description in Leigh Sotheby's catalogue, p. 64, no. 750, Politian collated this copy of Pliny with 'six ancient manuscripts; viz. two belonging to the library

This inscription,¹ in two parts, dated 1480 and 1490, is full of interesting information. In a few graphic words Politian remarks that when he first examined the text on August 15, 1480, he was already in possession of the priory of St Paul at Florence,² and about to begin his first public lectures in the Studio fiorentino,³ and that the Turks were at the moment besieging the town of Otranto in Apulia.⁴ Ten years later, on April 30, 1490,

of St Mark at Florence, two to Ferdinand, King of Naples, one to Nicholi, and one to Hermolaus Barbarus'. I have been unable to find any authority for this statement. The textual emendations which Politian says he had made to the more recent texts of Pliny, on the authority of the old codex in the Medici library, are all marked in this 1473 copy. See *Angeli Politiani opera*, Lugduni apud Seb. Gryphum, 3 vols., 1546, vol. i, *Misc.* 32, Pliny, *N.H.* 28. 2; *Misc.* 50, *N.H.* 25. 5; *Misc.* 57, *N.H.* 10. 22; *Misc.* 61, *N.H.* 14. 5. In *Misc.* 32 Politian mentions two old copies of Pliny in the Medici library, and in *Misc.* 50, 57 and 61 one of them. In *Misc.* 57 he describes it as belonging to the Medici public library (the library of St Mark), and in *Misc.* 61 he says: *in vetustissimo illo Mediceae familiae Pliniano codice, citato a nobis iam saepe*. See also Bandini, *Catalogus codicum latinorum bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentinae*, 4 vols. (Firenze, 1774-7), III, pp. 186-8 and note 1, p. 186, with reference to the thirteenth-century manuscript codex of Pliny, in two parts in the Laurentiana (Plut. 82, 1 and 2). This codex is also mentioned by C. Mayhoff in the Teubner ed. of *C. Plinii Secundi Naturalis historiae libri* 37, 5 vols. See vol. v (Lipsiae, 1897), pref. p. viii.

¹ *Recognovi XVIII Kal. Septembris: anno a Christiana Salute MCCCCLXXX Turcorum in Apuliam irruptione insignito cum Maxime hydruntia oppidum obsiderent. Florentiae In Divi Pauli. proprio sacerdotio. imminente publicae meae in oratoria arte, professionis Tyrocinio. Ang. Politianus.*

Anno dem MCCCCLXXX pridie Kalendas Maras: Cum tribus vetustissimis codicibus contuleram Idem Politianus: hoc ipsum exemplar: quorum duo ex Divi Marci Florentina bibliotheca: tertium e regis Ferdinandi. quod et Leonardi quondam Arretini fuerat, accepi, Proque instituto meo, ne illa quidem, quae liquebat, esse corruptam de veteribus omisi: Scilicet ut conjecturae locus emendaturo superesset: quin hoc ipso anno privatim Britannis quibusdam et Lusitanis, qui se Florentiam contulerant litterarum studio. cupientibus atque a me petentibus enarravi Septimestri spatio. θεῶν χάριν.

² From July to October 1477 Politian had negotiated with Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici to secure this appointment. He urged his case with Lorenzo in a humorous Latin epigram, see I. Del Lungo, *Prose volgari... poesie latine e greche... di Angelo Ambrogini Poliziano* (Firenze, 1867), pp. 122-3, Lat. epig. xxvi (1477) The document conferring him in office reached him on October 18, 1477, and on the following day Politian wrote to thank Lorenzo who was then at Pisa. *Ibid.*, p. 55, Ital. lett. ix. See also the previous letters vii and viii, and M. Scherillo, *Il rinascimento*, vol. II, part II of *Le origini e lo svolgimento della letteratura italiana* (Milano, 1926), pp. 307-9.

³ Politian's first lectures, in November 1480, were on the *Institutiones* of Quintilian and the *Sylvae* of Statius. He defended his choice of subject in his inaugural lecture, *Angeli Politiani oratio super Fab. Quintiliano et Statii Sylvas*, see vol. III, pp. 96-110, of the *Opera*, ed. cit. and vol. I, p. 161, *Epis.* vi. 1, Polit. to P. Beroaldo, Florence, April 1, 1494, where he writes: *quatordecimo fere abhinc anno nobis easdem publice Sylvas enarrantibus*. See also vol. I, p. 573, *Misc.* 58. For an account of Politian's lectures see I. Del Lungo, *Florentia, uomini e cose del quattrocento* (Firenze, 1897), pp. 176-83.

⁴ A similar remark appears in the *Epistolae ad Atticum, Brutum et Quintum fratrem cum ipseus Attici vita*, printed by Nicolaus Jenson at Venice in 1470, fol. This book is mentioned in the *Novelle* of Franco Sacchetti, 2 vols. (Firenze (Napoli), 1724), I, pref. p. 41, and was then at Rome in the house of the descendants of P. Vettori. Bandini, *Rag. ist.*, pp. lxiii-lxv, describes it and quotes Politian's inscription as follows: *Contulit Ang. Politianus cum libro quo Collutii Pierii primum, mox Leonardi Arretini, postremo Donati Accursoli fuerat, in eoque multa etiam Nicolai Nicholi, et Ambrosii Monachi manu ascripta erant. Anno Turcarum in Apuliam irruptione insignito, nonis Octobribus publicae nostrae Professionis tyrocinii tempore iam appetente, ad radices Fesulanis montis. Ang. Politianus.*

Then the inscription written with cinnabar or red lead continues in ink: *Est vero hoc mihi solemne quasi institutum corrigendorum Codicum, ut nihil a probatoribus exemplaribus*

Politian added a supplementary comment about the collation of the text and remarked that for seven months during that year he had given private lessons to some English and Portuguese students who had come to Florence to be taught by him.¹

The Englishmen in question were no doubt Linacre and Grocyn, who studied under him at Florence about this time.²

The Portuguese students were Luiz, Alvaro and Tristão, the three sons of João Teixeira, Chancellor of John II, King of Portugal.³ On August 17, 1489, Politian wrote a long letter to Teixeira, with a full account of their studies and good behaviour. He adds that they attended church daily, gave constant attention to their teachers, and kept fit by recreation at suitable times.⁴

Arius (or Arias) Barbosa, from Aveiro, who was later the first professor of Greek at Salamanca, where he taught for twenty years, was also one of Politian's Portuguese pupils.⁵

mutem; certaque adscribam, quae haud dubie cognoscam prava esse. ut scilicet periculum faciam, an ex ipsis quoque male cohaerentibus literis veram lectionem conectari aut eminisci valeam.

Politian makes three other references to the war with the Turks and the death of Mohamet II, on May 31, 1481, in the little Latin dictations to Piero de' Medici, see *Prose volgari*, pp. 18-21, 26-7, 34-7, ii, viii and xviii. The war is also mentioned in his letter to Pontano on the death of King Ferrante, *Epis.* ii. 8 [1494].

¹ These private lessons are also mentioned in the second *Praelectio de Dialectica*, see vol. iii, p. 177 of the *Opera*, ed. cit.: *et philosophiae libros nonnullos vel publice nobis (quod scitis) vel privatim studiosis aliquot hominibus enarravimus.*

² See *Erasmii Epistolae*, ed. P. S. and H. Allen, 7 vols. (Oxford 1906-28), ii, p. 441, *Epis.* 520, W. Latimer to Erasmus, Oxford, 30 January [1517]: *Nam et Grocinum memini, virum (ut scis) multifaria doctrina, magno quoque et exercitato ingenio, his ipsis literis duos continuos annos, etiam post prima illa rudimenta, solidam operam dedisse; idque sub summis doctoribus, Demetrio Chalcondilo et Angelo Politiano. Linacrum item, acri ingenio virum, totidem aut etiam plures annos sub iisdem praeceptoribus impendisse.* And p. 486, *Epis.* 540, Erasmus to W. Latimer, Antwerp, 24 Feb. 1517: *Ipse Grocinus cuius exemplum adfers, nonne primum in Aeglia Graecae linguae rudimenta didicit? Post in Italiam profectus audivit summos viros, sed interim lucro fuit illa prius a qualibuscumque didicisse.*

See Bandini, *Specimen literaturae florentinae saeculi xv*, 2 vols. (Florentiae, 1747), i, pp. 215-17 notes 12 and 13, and F. O. Menckenius (Mencke), *Historia vitae et in literas meritorum Angeli Politiani* (Lipsiae, 1736), pp. 80-2, who however says he cannot recall any reference to these studies of Grocyn in Politian's writings.

³ For an account of João Teixeira, see D. Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca lusitana historica, critica e cronologica*, 4 vols. (Lisboa, 1741-59), ii, pp. 773-4.

⁴ *Epis.* x. 3. They are also mentioned in the letter of John II to Politian, *Epis.* x. 2, Lisbon, October 23, 1491, and in Politian's previous letter to him, x. 1. One of these two boys, Luiz Teixeira Lobo, who studied in Florence under Politian, afterwards studied law under Bulgarino at Siena, and under Bartolomeo Soccino at Bologna. When about to return to Portugal he was offered the chair of Jurisprudence at Ferrara by Duke Ercole and taught there for two years. See L. G. Giraldus, *De poetis nostrorum temporum*, ed. Karl Wolke (Berlin, 1894), dialogue ii, p. 58, and Bandini, *Spec. lit. flor.* i, pp. 217-18, note 15. Barbosa Machado, iii, pp. 155-6, states that he came to Florence to be taught by Politian, in 1481. This date seems to be incorrect. See also W. P. Mustard, *The Eclogues of Henrique Cayado* (London, 1931), pp. 16-17, 86-7. Tristão, the youngest of the three brothers, died at Bologna in 1497 at the age of twenty-one.

⁵ Giraldus, dial. ii, p. 58; Bandini, *Spec. lit. flor.* i, pp. 217-18, note 14; N. Antonius, *Bibliotheca hispanica nova*, 2 vols. (Matriti, 1783), i, pp. 170-1; Barbosa Machado, i, pp.

Henrique Cayado, also from Lisbon, went to Florence in 1494, attracted by the learning of Politian, who however died soon after his arrival.¹ The 1496 edition of Cayado's eclogues, elegies and letters contains a short epigram addressed to Politian.² In a second book, published in 1501, he laments the death of his teacher in the second eclogue, in which he also relates that while bathing in a pond near Florence he was paralysed by the cold and almost drowned.³

Politian's copy of the fourth printed edition of Ovid's works, which is now also in the Bodleian,⁴ was bought in 1833 from Payne and Foss for £73. 10s.⁵

A manuscript statement written on the first page of the *Metamorphoses* states that on January 19, 1497, this book was given to the library of St Mark at Florence in compensation for books borrowed by Politian which had been lost or scattered after his death.⁶ Similar inscriptions can be found in other books which had belonged to Politian, as in the fifteenth-century codex of Lucretius,⁷ the thirteenth-century codex of the

76-8. In an epigram cited by Barbosa Machado, p. 76, Arius says that he shared Politian's lessons with Leo X:

‘*Me Condiscipulum Decima dum dico Leonis,
Et Condiscipulum Politiane tuum.*’

¹ See Giraldus, dial. ii, p. 57; Barbosa Machado, II, pp. 443-5; Antonius, I, pp. 565-7; G. Prezziner, *Storia del pubblico studio e delle società scientifiche e letterarie di Firenze*, 2 vols. (Firenze, 1810), I, p. 162; G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, 16 vols. (Milano, 1822-6), IX, tome VI, p. 1575; P. A. Budik, *Leben und Wirken der vorzüglichsten lateinischen Dichter des XV-XVIII Jahrhunderts*, 3 vols. (Wien, 1827-8), III, pp. 96-110, and Mustard's introduction to his edition of the eclogues.

² Hermicus Caiadus or Henrique Cayado, *Aeclogae, elegiae et epistolae*, Bononiae, apud Justin. de Ruberia, [1496], 4°. There are copies of this edition in the B.M. (11403. e) and the Bodleian (Auct. 5. Q. vi. 12).

³ *Aeclogae et sylvae et epigrammata Hermici*, Bononiae, Ben. Hectoreus, VII Kal. martii, 1501, 4°. Neither the B.M. nor the Bodleian have copies of this edition. Cayado's poems have been reprinted in A. dos Reys' edition of the *Corpus illustrium poetarum lusitanorum qui latine scripserunt*, 7 vols. (Lisbonae, 1745-8), I, pp. 51-259. See also the recent edition of the eclogues by Mustard.

⁴ *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera omnia*, Parmae, Stephanus Corallus, 1 Julii, 1477, fol., cum notis MSS. Ang. Politianus. (Auct. P. 2. 2.) The three earlier editions are: 1471, Bononiae, Balthasar Azoguidus, fol.; 1471-2, Romae, Sweynheym et Pannartz, 2 vols., fol.; 1474, Venetiis, Jacobus Rubeus, 2 vols., fol. (a reprint of the first edition). See Graesse, v, pp. 66-7. According to I. Affò, *Saggio di memorie su la tipografia parmense del secolo XV* (Parma, 1791), pp. lxiii-lxiv, the 1477 edition was a reprint of the Roman 1471 and the Venetian 1474 editions.

⁵ Macray, pp. 324-5. Probably this was at a private sale as the book is not mentioned in the auction sale catalogues of that date.

⁶ *Liber conventus S. Marci de florentia ordinis praedicatorum habitus a Syndrico die 19 Ianuarii 1497 pro compensatione librorum, qui commodati ad eodem conventu fuerant D. angeli Politiano, et in eius morte amissi sunt. Ponatur banco 270 occidentis.*

⁷ I examined this manuscript (Laur. Plut. 35. 29) while in Florence. The inscription is as follows: *Liber Conventus Sancti Marci de Florentia Ordinis Praedicatorum habitus a publicis sectoribus, pro libris, quos sibi ab eodem Conventu commodatos Angelus Politianus amissi, seu in morte Angelus Politiani amissi sunt.* This remark is preceded by the call number of the book: B. 27 Occidentis, and is repeated at the foot of the following page. The codex is described by Bandini, *Cat. cod. lat.*, II, p. 209.

Etymologicum magnum,¹ and a codex of Lecapenos, *de arte grammatica et aliorum alia*,² which are now in the Laurenziana.

When Bandini examined this copy of Ovid, which he described in 1762, it was then in the library of St Mark, where the *Etymologicum magnum* was also to be found.³ In 1791 when Ireneo Affò described the manuscript it was still there.⁴

In this 1477 edition Politian has written his *Ex Libris* after the title of the *Metamorphoses*.⁵ He collated this text, and also another one printed at Venice in 1488-9,⁶ with two old codices one of them from the Medici library and the other, which has since been lost, from the Library of St Mark.⁷ In both books the comments which he wrote at the conclusion of the different works are similar. In the 1477 edition these can be found at the end of the *Amores*,⁸ the *Ibis*,⁹ the *Fasti*,¹⁰ the *Tristia*,¹¹ the *libri ex Ponto*¹² and the *liber de Nuce*.¹³

¹ The *Etymologicum magnum* (Laur. 303) is mentioned by Bandini, *Rag. stor.*, pp. lix-lx, note 2, and is described by E. Piccolomini, 'Delle condizioni e delle vicende della libreria medicea privata dal 1494 al 1509', in *Archivio storico italiano*, Ser. III (1874-5), vols. xix-xxi; vol. xx, pp. 81-2: *Nicæe magni grammatici, etymologicum, in papiro, per alphabetum, in 4to folio; librum vetustum, litteris minutis, et in corio rubro decolorato* and contains the following inscription: *Liber Conventus Sancti Marci de Florentiæ Ordinis Prædicatorum habitus... die 19 Januarii in compensationem librorum, eiusdem Conventus, quos sibi commodatos A. Angelus Politianus perdidit*. There is also another note in Italian: *Questo libro fu di messer Agnolo Polthano et venne in S. Marco havuto da' Syndichi l' anno 1497, et recuperato dalle mani di Guarino da Camerino. Et dalli medesimi Sindici de' rebelli fu consegnato al Convento a' dì 19 di gennaio 1497, in compenso di libri di detto Convento che furono imprestati già ad M. Agnolo, antiquo padrone di questo libro, et alla sua morte si perderono*. These remarks were probably written by Zenobio Acciaiuoli the librarian of San Marco, who was also the editor of Politian's Greek epigrams. See I. Del Lungo, *Prose volgari*, pp. 171-2.

² (Laur. 314.) Also mentioned by Piccolomini.

³ Bandini, *Cat. cod. lat.*, IV, pref. p. xxxvii-xxxviii, and *Rag. stor.*, pp. lix-lxi.

⁴ Affò, p. lxiii.

⁵ ἀγγέλων κτήμα πολιτianaῦ καὶ τῶν φίλων.

⁶ *Publii Ovidii Nasonis opera, Lucantonii (Quintae) Florentini impensa, a Mattheo Capsaca Parmense accuratissime impressa. Anno MCCCGLXXXVIII, pridie Kalen. Januariar, in fol.* This copy is described by Bandini, *Cat. cod. lat.*, IV, pref. p. xxxvii, and in *Rag. stor.*, pp. lxi-lxii, who says that it belonged to the Vettori family.

⁷ F. W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Studies* (Oxford, 1913), p. 255.

⁸ F. 270 v.: *Contuli Politianus cum vetustis duobus exemplaribus, altero Marciae Bibliothecae: Altero Medicae. Illud a littera significatur, hoc b. 1493 Die 27 Septembris hora circiter tertia noctis. In Rusculo.*

⁹ F. 319 v.: *Ubi a littera est exemplar ex marciana bibliotheca significatur, ubi signum non est aut b exemplar medicae bibliothecae.*

¹⁰ F. 389 v. The inscription at the foot of the *Fasti* has been cut out. Probably it was similar to the one in the 1489 edition described by Bandini. See below, p. 399 note 1. In this 1477 copy of Ovid, f. 42, *Met.* 4; f. 174, *Met.* 15, and f. 392, *Tristia* 1, have been torn.

¹¹ F. 436 r.: *Contuli hos quinque tristium libros cum vetustis duobus Codicibus: se[d] vetustiore non nihil altero ex Divi Marci florentina bibliotheca, quod a littera indicat. Altero autem non perinde vetusto ex Medica Libraria, quod b littera significatur. ubi uterque congruit codex nihil apponimus signi. Observavi autem quod solem, ut de meo nihil adcerem. utque ne illa quidem interdum omitterem, quae mendosa esse liquebat Die XXI Iulii 1493. In Pauli. Auditoribus Nicolao Baldella et Roberto Minutio familiaribus. Ang. Politianus. Angelus Politianus.*

¹² F. 478 r.: *Contuli cum mediae vetustatis codice ex medica Libraria. usus quo solem instituto, ut nihil ab exemplari mutem ut si mendosum liqueat. In rusculo Fesulano III Kal. Octobr. 1493. IIII hora noctis. Politianus.*

¹³ F. 483 v. (in red): *Contuli cum exemplari ex D. Marci Bibliotheca Labellum hunc de Nuce die 21 iulii 1493 Politianus.*

The comments, quoted by Bandini, which Politian made when collating the 1489 edition are even more significant.¹ It is interesting to find that Politian attributes the fragment *de Medicamine faciei* to Ovid: *vel quod Ovidianus scribendi color est, vel quod pro suo Libellum, hoc titulo ipse agnoscit*. Likewise in the *Miscellanea*, on the authority of Seneca's *Controversiae*, and also on a similar analogy of style, he is inclined to attribute the whole book of the *Priapea* to Ovid, rather than to Virgil as Servius and others had maintained.²

In the margins of the 1477 edition Politian has written many summaries and notes, some of them in Greek, and also the comments and corrections which appeared in the *Miscellanea*.³ The pages containing Sappho's letter to Phaon are the most heavily annotated.⁴

I hope to continue this series of short articles with an account of other codices and early printed editions annotated by Politian, which are now in the libraries at Florence, Rome and Paris.

J. M. S. COTTON.

LIVERPOOL.

¹ Bandini, *Rag. stor.*, pp. lxi-lxvi: 'Precedono le Metamorfosi... Appresso è il Registro, in fine del quale AMEN. Seguono le *Epistole Eroïdi* colla sottoscrizione del Poliziano simile alla riferita di sopra.'

The *Ibis* follows the *Ars amandi* and at its conclusion is written: *Ubi a littera est exemplar ex Marcia Bibliotheca significatur, ubi signum non est, aut b exemplar Mediceae Bibliothecae*. After the *Fasti* Politian has written: *Recognovit Ang. Politianus cum vetusto Codice collatos Fastorum libros anno MCCCCLXXX V Kal. Quintilis Florentiae in Dvri Pauli. eodemque anno MCCCCLXXXII publice enarrabat. a littera S. Marci b Med. ubi nihil concordant*.

This second date, Bandini notes, should be either MCCCCLXXXII or MCCCCLXXXII.

Next come the *Tristia*, the *libri de Ponto*, *de Pulce*, *de Philomela*, *de Medicamine faciei*, *de Nuce* etc. 'Tutti' says Bandini 'hanno la sottoscrizione che concorda ad verbum con quella del Codice Marciano.' After the *de Medicamine faciei* Politian has written: *Puto hoc imperfectum esse opusculum, nam esse Ovidii pro certo habeo, vel quod Ovidianus scribendi color est, vel quod pro suo Libellum, hoc titulo, ipse agnoscit*. At the end of the book, after the printer's date, there is another comment: *Contuli cuncta Ovidii opera cum Codice qui fuit Ang. Politiani, quem ille multis antiquis codicibus collatis studiose emendaverat, is nunc adservatur in D. Marci Bibliotheca; summam autem adhibui diligentiam, ne quid quod in illius, chirographo notatum esset omitterem P.*

At the end of the book there is a Greek hymn written in manuscript and followed by the *Amores* 3. 5: *Nox erat* etc. and the comment: *hactenus reperi in Ovidiano vetusto codice in Dvri Marci Bibliotheca Florentiae. Politianus*. This is followed by a quotation from the letter of Paris to Helen, 11. 39-144. *Nec tamen est mirum—to Inter formosas altera nomen habet*. On this see H. S. Sedlmayer, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides* (Windobonae 1886), pref. p. viii.

² *Misc.* 59. See Seneca, *Controversiae*, 1. 2. 22, where a line of the *Priapea* 3. 8 is said to be Ovidian. R. C. Radford in his article 'The *Priapea* and the Vergilian Appendix' in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* (1921), LX, p. 177, says: 'I may add that the natural assumption is that Seneca's attestation for the Ovidian authorship applies to the whole book.' However he does not give the reference to Politian.

³ See f. 202 v., *Heroides* 9. 51-2, *Opera*, ed. cit., vol. 1, *Misc.* 29 and *Epis.* xi. 10, Politian to G. Merula [1489], p. 328; f. 318 v. *Ibis* 569-70, *Misc.* 75, and *Ambra* in I. Del Lungo's ed. *Prose volgari*, 11. 436-7; f. 405 r., *Tristia* 2. 417, *Misc.* 15; f. 405 r., *Tristia* 2. 443-4, *Misc.* 16.

⁴ See H. Brenckmann (Brenckmann), *Historia pandectorum*... Trajecti ad Rhenum (1722), pp. 307-8. P. Labbe *Nova bibliotheca manuscriptorum librorum... cum coronide poetica* (Parisus, 1653), p. 371, mentions a codex of Ovid containing scholia and variant readings written by Politian, who collated it with many others. He says this was brought to Paris from England and sold in 1652 to a German noble.

SOME UNPUBLISHED FRENCH POLITICAL POEMS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

IN the sixteenth century, the field of political satire was crowded, for the Reformation, in the first half, and, in the second, the Wars of Religion, provided ample scope for such as wished to attack or support the protagonists in the conflict. In France, the *gaulois* tradition of sly mocking was continued into the Renaissance, turning, as passions rose and turmoil grew, into bitter jeers and cruel insult. Principle overcame loyalty, so that one was no longer a good Frenchman, but a good member of one's Party.

Most of such writing appeared in the form of anonymous verse, the Huguenots being particularly active in this direction.¹ Political and militant poems, not only satirical, but occasional or topical, have been published in large number;² a few, however, have been recently found in the British Museum by the present writer. They are still in manuscript, and appear to be completely unknown.

One of the examples is cast in the curious poetical form of the 'double sonnet', in which, if each sonnet is read separately, the meaning is the exact opposite to that given by reading straight across, as if the two poems were one sonnet.³ It is dated 1587, and was written at the period when the struggle between King and League was coming to its height. The League grew daily in power, Leaguers allowing adherents to the King's party to exist on sufferance only, provided that they showed sufficient zeal and fierce cruelty against Huguenots.⁴ Already, as the poem shows, the fantastic claim of Guise to the throne of France⁵ was known at least to members of the League, although some care was taken to veil the statements made, by means of the double sonnet.

¹ Lenient's *Satire en France ou la littérature militante au XVI^e siècle*, 1866, although old-fashioned, is a useful guide.

² Cf. the numerous pieces scattered through the Journals of Pierre de l'Estoile, and the collection the same author made under the title of *Les belles figures et drolleries de la ligue*, Tome iv of the Brunet, Champollion... edition of L'Estoile, 1876. Again, Le Roux de Lincy's *Recueil de Chants historiques français*, deuxième série, XVI^e siècle, 1842, may be mentioned. From time to time, such poems also appear in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français*.

³ This is what it is, in reality, the broken lines making one alexandrine.

⁴ Cf. Joyeuse's remark to Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Histoire universelle*, Tome vii, pp. 125-6 (édition de Ruble).

⁵ The family traced its descent back to Saint-Louis.

Sonnet de la France, 1587

Plus ne fault endurer
 La ligue de Lorraine,
 Ils tiennent en leur mains
 Le fer pour nous tuer
 Il fault doncq'abhorrer
 Catholiques desseings,
 Des tigres inhumains,
 Nous voulans devorer
 Qui est plus proche aux Roys
 Que le Roy Navarrois,
 Contre l'usurpateur,
 La noblesse se plaint,
 Voyant un cœur menteur,
 Sous un pretexte saint.

La race de Bourbon
 Est la paix de la France
 De l'estat la defence
 C'est la Religion.
 De Bourbons la maison
 Ont trouble l'insolence
 De la fiere arrogance
 De leur ambition
 Que la maison de Guise
 Ne pille plus l'église,
 Le ciel est irrité.
 D'un si cruel ravage,
 Qui d'une sanctete,
 Couvre une ardente Rage¹

S²

Sir E. Hoby's Commonplace book yields another piece, similar in character. Written the year before the preceding sonnet, this seems to be the work of a penetrating clear-sighted man, able to divine the true motives and desires of the leaders in the struggle. In a few pregnant words, each speaker is made to give what is really an epitome of his own attitude, whether openly expressed or carefully and discreetly hidden. The sonnet is as follows:

*L'opinion et desir de plusieurs grands parsonages
 touchant les affaires de France, 1586*

Le Roy. Je desire la paix encore que la guerre ie iure.
Duc de Guise. Si la paix se faict, mon espoir n'est plus rien.
Duc de Mayne. Par la guerre nous croist le credit et le bien.
Cardinal de Guise. Le temps s'offre pour nous avec la couverture.
Le Roy de Navarre. Qui comptera sans moy, pensant que ie l'endure comptera par deux fois, il m'en assure. [*sic.*]
Cardinal de Bourbon. Chascun peust bien compter cela qu'il pretend sien.
La Roynne Mere. Cependant que mon filz dure, la dispute ne vault rien.
Le Pape. Neantmoins poursuivons la sainte ligue et ses effects.
L'empereur. Le Roy perdra doncques la France et ses subiects.
Le Roy d'espaigne. Si la France se perd, ie l'auray bien tost trouve.
La France. Tout beau, vous n'estes encore pour tel affaire appelle,
 Il ne fault point tant de chiens pour un os
 Je osteray plustost l'ambition qui trouble mon repos.³

The anonymous author is clearly not a Leaguer, yet he is no Huguenot. A King's man he may be, but the final speech, that of France, makes it plain that he is a moderate, possibly a member of the party of 'Les Politiques' of which the more liberal-minded and independent members

¹ MS. 38823. Sir E. Hoby, Commonplace book, fol. 47 verso.

² The S with a stroke through it was a cipher used by Henry of Navarre when writing to Gabrielle d'Estrées, but its presence here is somewhat difficult to explain.

³ MS. 38823. Sir E. Hoby, Commonplace book, fol. 69 verso.

would soon produce the *Satire Ménippée*. The short period of peace during the middle eighties enabled a comparatively balanced view of current events to be taken.

On the other hand, restraint and common sense are not features of this sonnet by Agrippa d'Aubigné, evidently addressed to Henry IV just after his marriage to Marie de' Medici in 1600. It will be seen that d'Aubigné's tone is one of sorrowful bitterness and harsh reproach, this being the attitude he was accustomed to adopt during his frequent quarrels with Henry of Navarre. The poem is written on a tiny scrap of paper, in, it would seem, d'Aubigné's own hand. It bears his signature.

Sonnet de l'Autheur au Roy

Ces jours solemnisez avec tant d'hommes
Qui de ton lit nœprier sont les fils premiers nés,
Tant de sanglants combats a plusieurs fois donnés
Dont nos plaines encor semblent toutes humides

Ce grand throsne abbattu par les mains parricides
Des fils de Babylone a te nuir obstinés
Qui en leurs vains efforts se monstrent estonnés
Voyans Dieu ta defense et les anges tes guides

Tant d'orages passez n'asseurent ils pas ta foy?
Quas tu contre Dieu qui fut tousjours pour toy?
Il t'appelle en son regne et tu fuis en l'abysme
Tu te monstres coupable et de meurtre et de sang
Aiguissant un cousteau pour te percer le flanc
Et adorant l'autel qui te veut pour victime.¹

Daubigné.²

D'Aubigné's intense dislike of Henry of Navarre's conversion still burned within him, expressing itself in this sonnet with as much vehemence as if that event too had only just taken place, instead of its having occurred as far back as 1593. Strict Huguenots continued to experience antipathy towards the King for what they considered to be his betrayal of the Cause. No longer could he be relied upon, and some went so far as to feel of him the same mistrust as was implied of Charles IX by an anonymous author who wrote, in the year 1572, that Coligny had died 'pour s'estre fié de la foy de son prince'. In this sonnet, however, we are far removed from the sneering tone of reproach and satire which characterizes much of the political verse of that time. This is a sad and noble glorification of the murdered Admiral, scarcely moving beyond the limits of simple truth.

¹ Sloane MS. 524, fol. 10.

² It will be observed that d'Aubigné uses here the old, Marotic form of the sonnet. It was his favourite mode for this genre.

Sonnet sur la mort de Gaspard de Colligny admiral de France

Gaspard qui pour son roy de sa premiere enfance
 Couvay changer¹
 Qui dans les escadrons du flamant estranger
 Souvent se fist chemin par le fer de sa lance
 Ce grand Gaspard helas qui les soldats de france
 Contre leur ennemys sceust si bien courager
 Et le fier espagnol tant de foix oultrager
 Est mort trahi des siens pour toute recompense
 Il est mort toutesfoix non au combat saingu
 Non en guerre surpris non par ruze deceu
 Non pour avoyr trahi son roy ne sa province.
 Mais bien pour aymer trop le repos des francoys
 Servir dieu puremen et reverer ses loix
 Et pour s'estre fié de la foy de son prince.²

Fulsome praise of the type so prevalent at the period, at least if the poem is addressed to or concerns one of high rank, is to be found in plenty in a hitherto unknown collection of verses offered by a minor poet, Jacques de Bonjeu, to Catherine de' Medici, and entitled *Dames illustres qui ont esté Roynes*. On her advice, Bonjeu wrote a presentation copy, and sent it in 1575 to Queen Elizabeth, with a dedicatory epistle. The book is of particular interest because of its date. Coming during the years of uneasy peace which constitute the period of semi-captivity spent by Henry of Navarre at Court, it reflects the courtier's attitude of respectful flattery, and is as well a *pièce de circonstance*, for in 1575 Catherine was endeavouring to obtain the hand of Elizabeth for her son François, duc d'Alençon, then a youth of twenty-one. The despatch of this collection of verse is indicative of the friendly relations which Catherine desired at that time to maintain with the English queen. The poems printed here are not the whole of the work, as some are fanciful but uninteresting evocations of queens of antiquity or early France. Those which I give are all concerned with contemporaries of the poet. He says that he writes the book for Catherine de' Medici, as a subject for tapestry, in the weaving of which she found pleasant relaxation, but it is not clear if he intended each poem to be placed, in the tapestry, beneath the picture of the queen or princess in question. Perhaps in reality Catherine's love of making tapestry was used as a pretext by Bonjeu for bringing himself before her notice by presenting her with his book. His letter to Queen Elizabeth is included below as being of interest to English readers:

¹ The paper is torn here, and the line effaced.

² Harl. MS. 1625, fol. 146.

*A treshaulte, treshexcellente et tresvertueuse Princesse,
Elizabet Royne d'Angleterre.*

MADAME, Platon le saige Philosophe a escript, que si la vertu se pouvoit voir des yeulx humains, elle inciteroit en nous une ardeur et affection merveilleuse envers elle: Ce qui est facile à croire, puis que les personnes ornées dicelle invitent, et quasi forcent, un chacun a les aymer, et honorer. Dont, Madame vous estes un rare, et singulier exemple, car ceulx mesmes qui n'ont eu cest heur de vous avoir veue, par ouyr seulement parler des riches graces que Dieu vous a departies, et de vostre tant sage conduite et gouvernement, vous aiment, et portent tout honneur, vous qui, par une providence plus que humaine, avez sceu par le cours de tant d'annees maintenir voz subiects en heureuse paix et concorde. Pourraison dequoy vous avez mis sur vostre beau chef la couronne de gloire immortelle. Ce que (Madame) me venant devant les yeulx en mon seiour des champs ou ie me suis retiré apres avoir servy cinq de nos Roys en estats honorables: voulant offrir a la Royne mere de nostre Roy, ma maistresse, quelque nombre de Dames illustres, tant antiques, que modernes, qui ont esté Roynes, pour de chascune faire une piece de tapisserie: Je n'ay voulu oublier vous mettre en ce beau rang, avec douze vers qui ne scauroient représenter la moindre partie de vostre merite. Lesquelz leus en la presence de ladicte Dame, ma maistresse, elle, par sa grand [sic] bonté, et courtoisie, les a non seulement trouve bons, et loué, mais ma commandé vous envoyer la copie du tout. Ayant donq', ma dame, un tel commandement, conforme a mon desir, bien humblement ie les vous presente, vous gardant encores quelques aultres petits labeurs de mon seiour des champs: lesquelz l'estimeray grandement honorez et moy aussi, silz vous sont agreables.

Priant Dieu

Ma dame, vous augmenter chacun iour ses belles graces dont il vous a si noblement enrichie, et vous maintenir longuemēt en toute ioye, et felicité. A Paris ce XV^e de Juin 1575.

Vostre tres humble serviteur
Jaq. de Bonjeu.

*Dames illustres
Qui ont esté Roynes¹*

: : : : : : : : : :

Marguerite Royne de Navarre sœur du grand Roy Francois

Qui bien scavoir vouldra ce que fu aultresfois,
N'aille pas rechercher la race des grands Roys,
Dont ie suis descendue, ains plustost voise lire
Ce que i'ay tant bien sceu et dictier, et escrire,
M'a bonne vie, et mœurs, et ardeur de ma foy,
Enflammée du tout en Jesus Christ mon Roy,
Pour lequel peu prisay les honneurs de ce monde,
En luy m'humiliant, ou toute grace habonde,
Il n'est plus grand scavoir, ny heur, en ce bas lieu,
Que se pouvoir congnoistre, aymer, et craindre Dieu.

Claude Royne de France, femme du grand Roy Francois

Fille, et femme de Roy, et de Roy ie fu mere,
Fille du Roy Loys, du peuple le bon Pere,
Femme au grand Roy Francoys, scavant, courtois, et preux,
Et mere de Henry, ce prince valeureux,
Qui en sa Catherine a repeuplé de France
Le sang, en quatre filz pleins de toute excellence:
Ainsi Dieu multiplie et la race, et les ans,
Des bons et vertueux, et destruit les meschans.

¹ Royal MSS. 20. a. xx. It is one of the 'Old Royal' manuscripts.

*Elizabet Royne d'Espagne, fille du Roy Henry ii,
du nom Roy de France*

Autant que chasteté faict les Dames florir,
Et la prudence peult de renom acquerir:
Aultant ie fu prisée en Espagne, et en France,
La France ma donna ma Royale naissance,
Fille du Roy Henry, de tous Roys le meilleur,
J'eü d'Espagne un grand Roy pour mary, et Seigneur,
Que bien tost ie laissé en ma fleur de ieunesse,
La terre abandonnant, prenant au Ciel adresse,
Mais peu vivre en vertu, est vivre pour tousiours,
En vice long temps vivre, est mourir tous les iours.

*Marguerite de France, fille du grand Roy Francoys,
Duchesse de Savoye*

Nul siecle du passé a rien veu de semblable
A tes perfections, ta vie, ta bonté,
Graces, esprit, scavoir, ta grande charité
Te firent Marguerite en tout incomparable:
Par un grand Duc tu euz la Couronne ducale,
Ta vertu ten donna une plus que Royale,
Dont la gloire tu feis, sur toute aultre, esclater:
Le vray pris de l'honneur cest de le meriter.

*Elizabet Royne d'Angleterre, fille de Henry viii.
du nom. Roy d'Angleterre*

Qui veult, Elizabet, voir une doulce grace,
Une aymable beaulté, un riche entendement,
Qu'il te voye, il aura tresgrand contentement,
Admirant les beaulx traicts de ta celeste face:
Qui veult ta vie, mœurs, et grand bonté, scavoir,
De ton peuple vers toy voye l'amour ardante,
Les acclamations, par ioye vehemente
Qu'il iette tout ravy alors qu'il te peult voir:
Heureuse Elizabet, a qui Dieu sceut donner
Les vertus, t'eslevant haulte d'honneur au temple,
Et la te delaissat aux Princes bel exemple,
Pour te voyant apprendre a saignement regner.

*Marguerite de France, fille du Roy Henry ii.
Royne de Navarre*

Qui vouldra voir la perle, et riche fleur deslité,
Que le lis faict paroistre au verger Navarrois,
Dont la grace embellist tout l'honneur de noz Roys,
Qu'il contemple a loisir la belle Marguerite:
Que plus n'aille vantant ses deux perles l'Egipe,
Ne l'Indois ses thresors, tant precieux, et beaulx,
Car la France a vaincu le pris de ioyaulx,
Et la gloire des fleurs en une Marguerite.

Elizabet d'austriche, Royne de France, femme du Roy Charles ix^e

Elizabet tu es la chaste turtrelle,
 Lamentant ses amours, dont la mort trescruelle
 Ta privée, emportant Charles ce Roy puissant,
 En graces, en vertus, en aage fleurissant,
 Qui par toy alloit la France, et l'Allemagne,
 Pour lequel, avec toy, maint en larmes se baigne,
 Et le grief de ton mal cest, qu'apres un tel Roy,
 Rien digne ne se voit de ta bonté et foy.

*Loyse de Lorraine, Royne de france, femme de Henry. iii.
 du nom, Roy de france, et de Poulongne*

Le pris de ta beaulté, et nompareille grace,
 Loyse t'ont levée au plus hault point d'honneur,
 Te donnant un grand Roy pour mary, et Seigneur,
 Qui tous Roys en haultx faicts, et proesse surpasse.
 Grande fut du destin la force, et l'efficace,
 Qui de tels parangons sceut faire l'union,
 Es quelz toute vertu, en sa perfection,
 Jecte l'esclat, qui tous par son clair lustre efface:
 Dieu, qui voz cueurs iognit, vueille par heur prospere
 De voz beaulx flans Royaulx maint beau fruit nous doier
 Que voyons apres vous fleurir, et couronner,
 Des graces, et vertus, du Pere, et de la mere.

Catherine Royne de France, femme du Roy Henry ii, du nom

Qui contempler voudra ton heur, graces, esprit,
 Ouquel le Ciel benin tout son meilleur comprit,
 Ton cuer tant liberal, ton bon sens, ta prudence,
 A bon droict te dira des Roynes l'excellence:
 Par le bon Roy Henry, deuxiesme de ce nom,
 Ravy en ses beaulx ans, plein de gloire et renom,
 De dix enfans peuplas le hault sang de la France,
 Puis sagement conduis leur ieunesse et enfance,
 Dont trois es premiers ans vers le Ciel retournerent,
 Quatre filz seullement, et trois filles resterent,
 Des quatre filz les trois tu vis Roys couronner,
 Et le quart un grand Duc provinces dominer,
 Des trois filles l'aisnée estre Royne d'Espagne,
 Et la seconde apres du Duc lorrain compaignie,
 La tierce de vertu, grace, et beaulté, tant rare,
 Porter heureusement le sceptre de Navarre:
 OR face nostre Dieu ta Royale semence
 Prendre, en toute vertu, chacun iour accroissance,
 Et toy cent fois heureuse, il beneisse cent fois,
 Par qui heureux voions l'honneur de tant de Roys.

The poem which appears below is not of great value from a literary point of view, but is included because the signature shows it to be written by Henry of Navarre for Gabrielle d'Estrées¹ as do the two S's with a stroke through them.

¹ It occurs in a Cotton manuscript, copied in a hand which is not later than the first quarter of the seventeenth century, and possibly earlier.

Stances

Nous qui fusmes nourriz entre jeux et delices
 De douceurs, de plaisirs, de Riz et de Blandices
 Ammant les Esprits d'amoureuses ardeurs
 Avons changé la paix et la douceur première,
 En dueilz en combats et en humeur guerriere
 Pour finir tout d'ung coup mille et mille labeurs.
 Ces Amants Portugais, d'une plainte Importune
 Faisoyent gemir le ciel de leur triste fortune
 Les criz, les passions, les pleurs et la langueur
 Offensoient le repos de nos divines Ames
 Les rigueurs, les desdams les fièrtés de ces Dames
 De nostre aise eternal empeschoient le bonheur.
 Nous voulons en Camp cloz que ces guerriers constiennent
 Les assaux de Beutez qui Captifs les retiennent
 Et qu'au pris de leur sang, leur nom soit glorieux.
 Mais des Dames aussi la force est rigoureuse,
 Qui jamais ne succombe en bataille amoureuse
 Ains triomphe tousiours d'ung loz victorieux.
 Qu'ilz viennent donc aux mains pour finir leurs querelles
 Ces Dames ne sont pas moins vaillantes que belles
 Que ne peut la valeur Joincte avec la Beaulte.
 Mes Dames ne craignez qu'au fort de la meslee
 Dans leur sang espandu soyt leur force escoulee
 Aux Combats amoureux leur cœur est indomté.¹



The published 'literature' of the Wars of Religion is copious, but these few poems seem of sufficient value to warrant a first printing, after their lying hidden for more than three hundred years. They do not descend to the merely scurrilous nor are they so extravagant as to be unworthy of attention. Their comparative moderation brings them into a different category, yielding a measure of importance for the historian, as well as some breath of the torment of the late sixteenth century.

SYLVIA L. ENGLAND.

ILFORD.

¹ Calig. MS. E. VII. folio 152.

SOME NOTES ON GERMAN DRAMA AS NATIONAL COMMENTARY IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

THE claim of realism, once made for Grimmelshausen, has recently been denied after careful stylistic study.¹ Paul Hankamer accepts the criticism of Alewyn and makes a more general judgement when he states that Grimmelshausen was not trying to paint a clear picture of the peasantry and soldiery of his time, but was concerned rather with an 'Urbild des Menschen'.² This does not mean that the novelist tried to cut himself off from facts; he was merely seeking, consciously and constantly, to transfer the interest from the immediate fact to something else, and often to suggest a larger meaning behind the particular episode or figure. Not only in the novel is this attitude and mode of treatment discernible, but also in much of the German dramatic writing of the seventeenth century, and particularly in those dramas which deal with the political affairs of the time. Sooner or later, however, stylistic and ideological questions arise. How is the individual fact or episode used? What general themes absorbed the dramatist's mind? These questions have been variously considered, and a comprehensive answer is in the present state of seventeenth-century research inconceivable; but a few further indications of what appear to be significant tendencies may not be without value.

It is well known that detailed and undisguised references to contemporary events were admitted in the German drama of that time. Evidence of the shock caused by the execution of Charles I of England is to be found not only in the pamphlets which soon began to appear,³ but also in contemporary dramatic literature. Apart from Gryphius's complete tragedy of *Ermordete Majestät*, we may note the surprising reference made by Sigmund von Birken in his *Krieges- und Friedensbildung* of 1649.⁴ A grotto is discovered, with epitaphs on a number of the princes and noblemen of the time, and among them are these lines on Carl Stuart, König in Engelland:

Welt, richt, ob auch ein Land darf seinen König schlachten
und wilst du nicht, so soll Gott selber Richter seyn.
Das unerhörte Tuhn laßt so nicht Wurtzeln ein,
man dörrft' ihr König, euch auch nach den Köpfen trachten.

¹ R. Alewyn, *Johann Beer*, pp. 198 et seq., Leipzig, 1932.

² Paul Hankamer, *Deutsche Gegenreformation und deutsches Barock*, p. 97, Stuttgart, 1935.

³ R. Friebsch, *German Pamphlets in Prose and Verse on the Trial and Death of Charles I*, London, 1914.

⁴ *Krieges- und Friedensbildung in einer, Bey hochansehnlicher Völkreicher Versammlung, öffentlich vorgetragenen Rede, aufgestellt, Nebenst einer Schäferrey, Durch Sigismund Betulius, Nürnberg... M.DC.XLIX*, p. 75.

When we turn to affairs within Germany we find this same obvious alert interest in actual events illustrated by abundant references in the drama. The dramatist became indeed an occasional poet and used the stage to do honour to figures who had won public esteem. Gustavus Adolphus was represented many times in plays which appeared during his lifetime; upon his death they appear to have ceased.¹ Werner Milch has collected the names of the most important Protestant plays which make specific reference to him.¹ The first recorded is a play in Latin by Johann Narssius which appeared in Prague in 1628. Then comes the period of Sweden's decisive intervention in Pomerania after which the important German trilogy of Micraelius was published: *Pomeris, Parthenia* and *Agathander* (1631, 1632, 1633). The last-mentioned year marks the end of the short-lived German enthusiasm for Sweden. The form of such plays, which had their origin in personal eulogy, inevitably cramped any free and living treatment and hindered frank characterization. Micraelius' play *Agathander* suffers because the dramatist, in order to ennoble his theme, had recourse to a pseudo-classical form.² He was drawn towards allegory, and an allegory on the life of a person of his own day was bound to end in compromise. Teutonia has five daughters, probably meant to be Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Prussia, Magdeburg and Augsburg, and represented as a chorus of nymphs. Even the personality of the hero, the champion of their cause, is made cold and insubstantial as an embodiment of the quality of goodness under the name of Agathander. His assailants are scarcely more real. Tilly suffers least change of name, but Wallenstein becomes Lastlew. The only figures in which there is no compromise are the peasants. They are not really parts of a scheme, although they may have been purposely introduced to satisfy the demand for new characters in each succeeding act; they live and show convincing human weakness. The Catholic peasant is questioned by Vindelicia concerning the time when he was a prisoner in the hands of Agathander:

- Vind.* Dünkt er dich ein Tyrann zu sein?
Vill. Soll ich wahr reden sag ich Nein.
Vind. Kam nicht sein Volk wie Menschen pflegen
 Dir fur?
Vill. Was ist daran gelegen?
Vind. Waren sie Menschen sage mir?
Vill. Bahren sind's nicht und Murrelthier.
Vind. Können sie dann auch wol Wort machen?

¹ W. Milch, *Gustav Adolf in der deutschen und schwedischen Literatur. Germanistische Abhandlungen*, 59, Breslau, 1928.

² J. Micr. *Agathander pro Sebastia vinctens, et cum Virtutibus Triumphans...* Gedruckt im Jahr 1633.

Vill. Ich muß demer furwar doch lachen
 Und hor: ich hab verwundert mich
 Daß sie sich sogar Christenlich
 Vnd so weißlich konten geberden.¹

Obvious reluctance, rising temper, crestfallen submission are here delightfully portrayed; and in the succeeding dialogue the peasants remain true to their nature; as soon as they hear anything that reminds them of principles that have been drilled into them, they at once raise an outcry against heresy, so that Vindelicia is left to conclude that they, as followers of Abaddon, must stupidly pursue their way to perdition. But the rest of the play is not so substantial. Gottladius (apparently a purely allegorical figure) in dialogue with Lastlew regrets the time of luxury that is past, when Venus, Ceres and Bacchus were his daily guests and Lastlew had Megalinn as wife (a reference perhaps to the possession of Mecklenburg).² The dramatist had chosen a form of art which is not in itself defective, but failed through attempting to mingle (without combining) the unique and actual with something which is general and timeless.

A similar incomplete allegory is Simon Dach's Singspiel in honour of Wladislaus IV of Poland.³ The sequence of historical events is accurately followed. Danger threatens Poland from the Muscovites, Tartars and finally from Sweden. The movement culminates in the third act with the submission of the first two enemies, the final settlement corresponding to the Peace of Polyankova of March 1634. The truce of Stuhmsdorf between Sweden and Poland is anticipated in the fifth act. The opportunity even of dramatic treatment afforded by the interference of Sweden is not lost, and the mood of suspense (in the fourth act) is expressed by the chorus of herdsman. But the interest, which is meant to centre upon a human figure, somehow misses its mark and hovers about the vague and shadowed form of it on the clouds of a pseudo-classic phantasy.

Swiss-German plays, hampered by a non-dramatic concern for pageantry, continued to show this same diffusion and dispersal of interest after the beginning of the eighteenth century. *Das verwirrte aber wieder hergestellte Griechenland* of 1712, by J. R. Nüsperli, bears even in its title evidence of a tendency to find an image for national and contemporary affairs in the life of another age—which is not the purest form of allegory;

¹ *Loc. cit.*, Act v, 1.

² *Loc. cit.*, Act III, 2.

³ *Cleomedes der allerwerthe und lobwürdigste treue hirt der crowh Pohlen. Bibl. Stuttg. Lit. Ver.*, vol. cxxx, pp. 517 et seq. Cf. ed. Walther Ziesemer, *Schriften d. Königsberger Gelehrten Ges.*, Sonderreihe, Bd. 5, Halle, 1937.

Griechenland is Switzerland celebrating the peace after the Toggenburg war.¹

To avoid such vagueness and compromise, various ways were open to the comedy writer and to the writer of serious drama.

That there could be no development of political comedy in Germany during the seventeenth century has been argued by Hans Prutz.² Until the nineteenth century the country lacked that 'vielgestaltiges, an Gegensätzen reiches innerpolitisches Leben' which Prutz regards as essential for the growth of political comedy. But because his conceptions are determined by Aristophanes, he fails to admit that comedy may be political without being limited to faction. Even though the centre of gravity of political interest lay outside Germany, growing consciousness of national character and foreign peculiarities gave the dramatist a theme which could be treated in a sufficiently lowly and material fashion to produce a comic effect.

Hints of general national characterization came to have some appeal in the course of the seventeenth century for those who sought to show the typical foreigner on the stage. It is true that little advance was to be made in this direction till long after the close of the century; for genuine and convincing characterization there is little to choose between Weise's Scotsman (in *Urwilda*) and Schiller's. But at the beginning of the seventeenth century there was scarcely even an attempt to characterize the foreigner. The Italian chimney-sweep of Jakob Ayrer was no more truly foreign than the prototype in Frischlin;³ the humanist's use of the vernacular is striking, but it is entirely external. It was the growing consciousness of contact and conflict that very gradually directed the thoughts and efforts of the playwrights. With attraction came repulsion, and the craving for non-German modes and manners stirred conservatism to revolt. 'Frantzosen und Italiener nehmen uns Teutschen unsern Vorrath und schicken uns hingegen ihren Vnflath'⁴ became the typical plaint; in such sharp denunciations, in the gibes of high and low at Machiavellism and *raison d'état* did cultural differences find their expression. The Poetics of Kaspar Stieler illustrate in light satirical mood this discriminating interest in the characterization of the foreigner.

¹ See J. Baechtold, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in der Schweiz*, p. 472, Frauenfeld, 1919.

² H. Prutz, 'Zur Geschichte der politischen Komödie in Deutschland', *Sitzungsber. Bayer. Akad. Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philolog. Kl.*, 1919, Abt. 3.

³ Frischlin, *Julius Redivivus*, *Lateinische Literaturdenkmale des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts*, 19, Berlin, 1912.

⁴ Ludov. Dunte, *Decisiones Mille et sex casuum conscientiae*, p. 344, Section 5, Erfurt, 1648.

Stieler speaks of the playwright's concern for 'Landesart'; he will show 'den Franzmann'...

in einem Modekleid erhitzt vor der Stirn,
frech, jahe, liederlich, verlistet im Gehirn,
verraht-verachtersch, mit Fluch und Schwur vermeßen,
in Lieb' und Haßen schnell und blind, und treuvergeßen
beym schnoden Eigennutz. Der Welsche halt geheim,
was er gedenkt und wunscht, ist tückisch; Honigseim
sußt ihm oft Mund und Blick, da Gall' und Koloqvinten
ihm auf- im Hertzen -qvillt....

Hingegen ein Spanjol voll Übermut und Pracht,
der kleine Tahten tuht und große Worte macht,
voll Zorn und Grausamkeit, wo er die Obhand krieget,
schnarcht, pochet, scheumt und raaßt, auch wenn er unterliegt.¹

There follows a typical condemnation of German 'Fremdländerei'.

Comedy might retain an effective though less obvious hold upon affairs of the moment by admitting a passing reference to events. This was the simple device employed by Gryphius in his *Horribilicribrifax*. Though his references are a touch of 'Zeitkolorit' which lack precision, I cannot see in *Horribilicribrifax* merely the patriotic effort of the philologist and purist to pour scorn upon the ruling mode of speech. This one-sided emphasis of the linguistic aim of the comedy led Gundolf to the claim that it is only the 'Sprachfratzen' that change the old *miles gloriosus* into a German soldier of a definite period.² On the contrary it would seem that Gryphius was careful to make the necessary references because he had in mind soldiers of the Thirty Years War.

Horrib. ...hab ich nicht den König in Schweden niedergeschossen? bin ich nicht Ursach, daß die Schlacht vor Nördlingen erhalten...was wer es auff dem Weissen Berge gewesen, sonder mich?³

Even the fantastic reference to the naval victory at Lepanto is used to suggest the period.⁴

A comedy which, while not without intrinsic merit, is interesting because of its use of topical references, is the anonymous *Pedantischer Irrthum*.⁵ The mark of its period seems to have escaped notice, though it is in substance clearly a product of the year in which it was published—1673. Probably it was written hurriedly in the second half of that year (the author's Apology mentions the haste of composition). The pedant Ignatius, boastfully proclaiming his ability to save the country, makes it

¹ Ed. Joh. Bolte in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 1926.

² Fr. Gundolf, *Andreas Gryphius*, p. 59, Heidelberg, 1927.

³ Gryphius, *Horribilicribrifax*. *Deutsche Lit. in Entwicklungsreihen, Barockdrama*, IV, 124.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, p. 126.

⁵ *Der Pedantische Irrthum Des überwütigen doch sehr betrogenen Schulfuchses... Rappersweil*... 1673.

his condition that the Electoral Prince of Brandenburg and Montecuculi shall each give him twenty horse; with these, he says 'ich wollte den Turenne anagramatikos das Du renne lehren, ich wollte für das Vaterland fechten'.¹ The danger that threatened the country from the French side became serious in the early part of 1673, when Turenne led an army against Brandenburg. The four young gamesters who are on the point of becoming soldiers are not at all sure in which army they are to enlist. The dramatist strikes the popular note of the soldier-scene, the greed for booty being the decisive factor. Kuntz resolves to throw in his lot with the French. Reitz represents the honest supporter of the Elector, with a firm belief in his merits. Ruppert, to prevent a quarrel, says it does not matter which side they join; let them drink the toast of both Emperor and King of France, and bless or curse in their hearts as they will. Poetic justice brings the miserable opportunist by a series of disasters to abject poverty. He appears as a beggarman, seven months afterwards, that is, after the *historical* conclusion of the campaign. The play has thus a roughly drawn background of historical events. The ideas also are by no means vague in their reference. The play shows marked anti-Jesuit tendency (perhaps even the name Ignatius for the pedant is significant); schoolmasters are criticized; the clergy are blamed for their over-zealous recitation of the categories of sin:

Der Geistliche verdammet auff der Cantzel an Gottes Stelle. . . die Diebe, Ehr- und Geld-Geitzige, Sauffer, Hurer, und was ihm das volle Hertze in den übergehenden Mund giebt. . . daß er bey den Einfaltigen mehr Schaden durch Aergerniß, als Nutzen . . . stiftet.²

The pedant's language calls forth a tirade in defence of the pure German speech:

Unsere Teutsche Sprache ist reich und uberreich: Wann wir nicht arm an Verstande wären, uns mit ausländischen, den Bettlern gleich, zu bereichern. . .³

And finally, much of the prevalent war-spirit finds expression in the course of the play. The phrases used by Ignatius about methods of warfare were doubtless concrete enough to be vehicles of the comic intention:

Meine Machinen so ich inventiret, solte Lipsius mit besserm Ruhm beschreiben. . . Ich wolte sie [the enemy] mit fliegenden Engeln und Teuffeln nocturno tempore in fugam vertiren, ich wolte sie durch feurige ignivoma spectra, de animiren, ich wolte durch meine Spionen einen gewissen Schnupftaback in die castra lassen spargiren, daß man alle hostes im niessen, könnte trucidiren. . . ihr Wasser mit einem spiritu chymico inficiren. . . eine gantze fliegende Armada jhnen über den Hals schicken, so mir mellem, jhnen aber aculeate fellem propiniren solte.⁴

(The last passage, with its suggestion of demoralizing the enemy and then

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 95.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 133.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 223.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 99-100.

using chemicals and insects against them has an oddly familiar ring in our own time!)

In contrast to these methods of the comedy writers, the way of the serious dramatist was to avoid at once the immediate reference to single episode and the vague eulogy of great people, in order that he might give one thought and theme its due importance. This was the way of Johann Rist. Born at Ottensen in 1606 Rist was, of all the dramatists of his time who chose the theme of contemporary events, the greatest and the one most favoured by circumstances and by disposition. 'An keinem Schriftsteller der Zeit', Kuno Francke has said, 'offenbart sich der kräftigende Einfluss der nationalen Not auf das individuelle Empfinden deutlicher als an dem zartbesaiteten, sentimentalén Johan Rist.'¹ He spent the middle years of his life under the strain of the Thirty Years War, yet as his home lay beyond the main theatre of war, he was able to view the events of the time in clearer perspective than many—not, it is true, without suffering personal loss,² but still without being mentally blinded in the midst of the conflict. The immediate evils which came to assume objective clearness in Rist's mind were war and the soldiery.

However disruptive or inhibitory the effect of the war may have been upon German literature in the seventeenth century, it at least gave it a theme and figures that were arresting and real. The soldier's profession and the soldier himself came to be seen in a different light, because his presence was an oppression that had never before been realized on such a stupendous scale. Isolated references there had been it is true: Florentinus in Ayrer's *Edward III* had for example avowed a personal dislike for war.³ The soldier had long been a conventional figure on the stage, borrowed from the Latin comedy, but as a type more of the boaster than of the aggressor. Bohemus had even created soldiers who were greedy for illicit gain;⁴ but his condemnation of them on their departure for the war contrasts unpleasantly with his obvious delight in the soldier-scene.⁵ The indulgence of the early part of the century passed when the presence of the soldiery became a more serious fact of everyday life. The transition was gradual; inevitably the belief recurred that the soldier, though deprecated as extravagant and destructive, must yet be seen as part of

¹ K. Francke, *Die Kulturwerte der deutschen Literatur*, II, 288, Berlin, 1923.

² Torstenson attacked Wedel in 1643.

³ Ayrer, *Comedia von König Edwardo dritten diß Namens, König in Engelland*.... *Bibl. Stuttg. Lit. Ver.*, vol. LXXVIII.

⁴ Martinus Bohemus, *Holofernes und Judith*, p. 102, Wittenberg, 1618. (*Drey schöne Geistliche COMOEDIEN*... *Durch Martinum Bohemum Wittenberg.* In Verlegung Clemen Bergers Im Jahr 1618.)

⁵ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 62 ff.

a divine plan of retribution. An interesting illustration of this appears in an issue of the *Corant or Weekly Newes, from Italy, Germany... and the Low Countries* dated from Breslau, September, 1621:

In this Countrey the Slesian soldiers haue a good time, are secure, haue what they will, take whatsoever they can get against mens wills, consume the Countrey and the Townes, and yett will be paid at the full, which is a speciall punishment of God layd upon this Countrey.

In 1649 faith and demographic theory are strangely mingled by von Birken, who, trusting in God's goodness, thinks of war and famine as necessary means of preventing over-population.¹ But unequivocal criticism of the soldier's trade is put in the mouth of the clown in a play of the middle years of the war. In the anonymous *Tugend und Lasterspiel* produced in Copenhagen in 1634 the soldier retains a conventional name (Thraso) but he goes to fight at Hoffenburg. Hans Bratwurst mocks at him:

Want en ys dat niet een grote Sottigheit van v, wann gy kunt Rust ende guden Peis hebben, so fangt gy an to kriegen. Wann dan den Orlog angefangen ys, so muth gy den Peis ofte den Frieden erbidden....²

It is a significant fact that the comic figure, the 'realist', should have added the soldier to the victims of his wit; this passage and, to take an example from the later years of the century, the corresponding dialogue between the Morio and the young soldier in Joh. Sebastian Mitternacht's tragedy *Der unglückselige Soldat*³ of 1662, are entirely different in spirit from the contest between Johan Bouset and Vincentius Ladislaus in the Duke of Brunswick's comedy.⁴ There it was essentially the braggart, now it was the soldier as soldier who aroused criticism. The theme was popular, waiting only for effective expression, and it received it, once in the novels of Grimmelshausen, and once in the dramas which bear the name of Johann Rist.⁵

Rist's plays are the outcome of profound moral judgement; they are condemnations of the evils of the time and are inspired by hope for the future. But whereas the *Irenaromachia*⁶ is directed against Mars and

¹ *Krieges- und Friedensbildung*, p. 52.

² Joh. Bolte, 'Hans Bratwurst in Kopenhagen, 1634', *Jahrbuch des Vereins für niederdeutsche Sprachforschung*, LIV, 50, Hamburg, 1929.

³ Cf. C. Reuling, *Die komische Figur in den wichtigsten deutschen Dramen bis zum Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts*, p. 131, Stuttgart, 1890.

⁴ *Comoedia... Von Vincentio Ladislao... Wolfenbüttel*, M.D.XCIV. Goedeke und Tittmann, *Deutsche Dichter des 16. Jahrhunderts*, vol. XIV, Act VI, Sc. 5.

⁵ Rist has been generally held responsible for at least the major part of the *Irenaromachia*. Goedeke and Goetze (Rist, *Dichtungen. Deutsche Dichter des 17. Jahrhunderts*, p. xlviii, Leipzig, 1885) refer to Stapel's authorship as 'Täuschung'. Cf. also W. Flemming, *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, Barockdrama*, VI, 122: Rist is regarded as 'die treibende Kraft'. His authorship was finally established by O. Heins in his excellent monograph *Johann Rist und das niederdeutsche Drama des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Marburg, 1930.

⁶ *Krieg und Friede, Irenaromachia*, Hamburg, 1630. Cf. ed. W. Flemming, *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, Barockdrama*, vol. VI.

ends with his trial and punishment, when the theme is again caught up eighteen years later, the interest centres on the figure of Germany herself: *Das Friedewünschende Teutschland* shows a sufferer undergoing punishment for her misdeeds. The Mars of the *Irenaromachia* is not an unjustifiable villain; he pleads that he has only done what Jupiter ordained in chastizing humanity for its evil customs, and it is on the basis of this plea that final judgement is awarded. Mars is chained and Irene alone has the right and power to loose his bonds whenever she deems it good to chasten mankind again. But the breadth of the accusation, the condemnation of humanity's misdeeds, seems weak and inconclusive in comparison with the steady progress of corruption in the later play, which begins with the sin that Germany has committed, and cannot stop before the threshold of complete expiation is reached. Here there is an inwardness in the dramatic theme which was lacking before. It was natural at a time when the issues seemed clearer, and the Protestants could speak of the coming overthrow of Antichrist and could look to the Swedish King as a champion of all they held most holy, that a poet should yield to a superficial and biased affection which hailed victories as the sign of God's will to save his people. Such was the mood which found expression in Rist's own poem on the victory of Hamelin:

O Teutschland, freue dich, jetzt ist aufs neu zerbrochen
Die Macht des Antichrists;

Die Liga sitzt betruht und muß bekennen frei,
Daß unser Beistand selbst der Herr gewesen sei.¹

It was very different when the war had dragged on and the armies of the League and the Union alike had sullied themselves in an unbridled search for material gain. Now there is only a longing for a virtuous and ordered life, for the peace that was denied because men had turned away from God:

Müchten wir doch nur in Zucht
Tugendmäßig leben! . . .²

Even the *Irenaromachia* had levelled pointed criticism at the fostering of the war-spirit; Irene reproaches the captain for drilling children.³ But,

¹ Rist, *Dichtungen. Deutsche Dichter des 17. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 156-7, Leipzig, 1885.

² *Neues Freudenlied*, 1649. *Loc. cit.*, p. 162.

³ *Irene*. Ists nicht gnug daß die Alten Kriege führen? Ihr Jungen müßt euch auch darzu gewöhnen?

Capitan. Die Fraw ärgere sich nicht daran, wir spielen nur.

Lieuten. Wolt jhr vns das Spielen verbieten?

Irene. Ich wil euch das spielen nicht verbieten; Aber ehrliche Spiel, so Kindern geziemen sollet jhr spielen.

Capit. Ist diß denn ein vnehrlich Spiel?

Irene. Solche Spiel gebühren euch nicht zuspieren, denn worzu ein Knabe in der Jugend gewehnet wird, darzu hat er sein lebenslang lusten.

in the years which followed, Rist came to complete clearness about the scourge and menace of war. The ambition and the whole way of life of the soldier bring sharp rebuke from his pen in the *Friedewünschendes Teutschland*.

Rist's drama had, as we have seen, a point of origin in the decadence of Germany in his own time. The contrast between the old and the new—a motif which had been insubstantial in the dialogue of Frischlin and had served no weighty purpose when Ayrer re-echoed it in the vernacular—now acquired a fuller significance as an integral part of a dramatic theme of evil, brought to a term after suffering, by hope of redemption.

The appeal of Rist's mode of treatment remained. Gaedertz pointed with some scorn to what he considered to be a very profitable plagiarism.¹ This is the *Ratio Status* of 1668.² It is an abstraction; the Germany of Rist became for the anonymous dramatist Utopia, the word being used without any very clear reference to the humanist's interpretation. But there is a collection of detail about foreign campaigns which suggests data taken from another literary source or perhaps even from actual fact,³ for which the form of Rist's play provided merely a framework.

Before the publication of Rist's *Friedejauchzendes Teutschland*⁴ another pastor of the North, Johann Henrich Hadewig, had extended the scheme of the *Friedewünschendes Teutschland* until it assumed colossal proportions. In Hadewig's *Friede Erlangtes Teutschland*⁵ there are thirty-eight named characters, the dramatis personæ including Moses, Hercules and Saint Paul, and in addition to these some anonymous angels. The thoroughness of the German pastor-poet carries Hadewig even farther than it carries Rist; when he deals with the period of Saxon paganism he is careful to add an annotation. In the main he follows closely the plan

Lieuten. Ist denn das nicht gut, daß man sich in der Jugendt zum Kriege gewehnet? so kan man sich darein schicken wenn man groß wird.

Irene. Es were aber viel besser, daß jhr dazu gehalten würdet, wie jhr lernen konnet Frieden zuerhalten als gefährliche Kriege zuführen.

Capit. Jetzund aber ist jimmer Krieg in der Welt.

Irene. Das kompt daher, daß niemand weiß den Frieden zuerhalten....

Signifer. Last vns nur fort spielen H. Hauptmann, was haben wir mit dem Weibe zuthun?

Capit. Monsieur Lieutenant, exerciret nur fort.

(*Irenaromachia*, ed. W. Flemming, p. 179.)

¹ K. Th. Gaedertz, *Das niederdeutsche Drama von den Anfängen bis zur Franzosenzeit*, Berlin, 1884. Cf. also W. Flemming, *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, Barockdrama*, VI, 126: 'das schulmeisterliche Gemächte Ratio Status'.

² *RATIO STATUS, oder der itziger Alamodisierender rechter Staats-Teufel. In einem neuen Schauspieler abgebildet. Gedruckt im Jahr Anno 1668.*

³ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 68–70.

⁴ Nürnberg, 1653. Cf. ed. H. M. Schletterer, Augsburg, 1864.

⁵ *Friede Erlangtes Teutschland In einem Schauspiel auffgeführt und beschrieben Von Johan Henrich Hadewig. Hannover... MDCLj.*

of his greater predecessor, the correspondence with Rist being almost literal in the scene where Germany is discovered in grief.

Rist retains in his plays the tone of the preacher; he has the common misgivings lest his admission of Mercury should appear reprehensible in a professed Christian, and changes the heathen messenger into a servant of God in a way which must have satisfied the less fanatical among the pietist critics of the end of the century.¹ Rist's sincerity and the seriousness of his message doubtless did much to secure his fame; but the prolonged life of his drama, demonstrated by the borrowings I have mentioned and by the fact that the *Friedewünschendes Teutschland* passed through six editions between 1647 and 1649², is attributable not solely to depth of meaning and unassailable spiritual conviction, but in no small degree also to the formal quality of the play. 'Rist...ist der selbstständige Dichter eines literarischen Volksschauspiels und damit einer neuen dramatischen Form': in these words Paul Hankamer summarizes his achievement as a popular poet.³ It is our immediate concern to enquire not so much into a new mode which Rist established, but into the way in which he used a traditional form, the form of allegory.

Allegory as a poetic form seems to present peculiar difficulties to the literary craftsman; the fusion of the percept and the concept is in the allegory a specially arduous task; and the complete coalescence of image and spiritual content is apparently attainable only by the very few. A formal comparison of Goethe's *Faust* with the Hungarian *Tragedy of Man* of Emery Madách might reveal this difference between complete and incomplete fusion.

The habit of mind of the seventeenth century was characterized by a leaning towards allegory. The members of the 'Sprachgesellschaften' built an allegory round themselves, and their activities gained meaning by the forced references to plant-life. The 'poetry of nature' of the time was generally associated with human affairs, nature herself providing not so much a setting or a sublime contrast as an interpretation or a parallel, and the motif of the echo finds its true home in the seventeenth-century pastoral scene.⁴ The cult of the clock and that final frenzy of astrological enquiry were part of an insistence upon meaning, upon the construction or contemplation of forms that should have some far-flung and lasting reference to the intangible and spiritual. On a cross-staff in the canvas of

¹ *Das friedewünschende Teutschland*, Goedeke und Goetze (Rist, *Dichtungen*, pp. 3-4, Leipzig, 1885).

² Cf. W. Flemming, *Deutsche Literatur in Entwicklungsreihen, Barockdrama*, vi, 126.

³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 342.

⁴ Cf. A. Moret, 'Les différentes conceptions de la nature... dans le lyrisme allemand du baroque'. *Revue germanique*, April 1936.

a mid-seventeenth century death-bed scene is traced the motto: *Numerantur astra, mare novit limites—Terrae mensura datur, Immensus Dolor*.¹ The instrument has been so placed by the painter that the thing itself and the phrase that justifies it and links it to incorporeal truth shall arrest and retain the eye of the beholder.

For the plastic artist and the poet of that time *things* have a special and a heightened value, because they are more than they seem. The dramatist, even though he may not be concerned with ultimate verities (and we find very little reference to anything so remote and vague) is urged to use episodes and persons not 'realistically', that is, not as actual, individual and therefore essentially ephemeral things, but as tangible and sensuous signs of an aspect of truth of which he is himself convinced.

Custom and a growing tradition could not of course in themselves insure homogeneity of style. Some of the examples already cited have illustrated an unevenness in the poetic scheme. The particular attributes of the individual person or situation were sometimes overstressed and the claim of general significance was partially eclipsed. One of the most striking examples of the use and abuse of allegorical form in seventeenth-century drama is to be found in the political application of the old motif of physician and patient. The quacksalver was fair game for the playwright because, like the *miles gloriosus*, he pretended to abilities which he did not possess. But the growing popularity of the medical motif, not always with a comic purpose, is to be associated with something else, and that is the prevalent high concern (common to the comic stage and the most exalted religious lyric) for the body and the senses, not with any ulterior purpose of hygiene or other materialistic doctrine as justification, but simply as tangible manifestations of a force of life and growth and decay that was keenly and deeply felt. It was a motif which required skilful handling if it was to be used allegorically. Rist was induced to materialize the theme of suffering Germany by means of this image² and he was followed in this also by his anonymous imitator, the author of *Ratio Status*. The latter borrows the main details of the situation: the causes of a country's decline, too eager welcome to the overtures of foreign peoples, are symbolized by the acceptance of rich foods and wine. The charlatan Ratio Status gains audience and completes the wreckage of the nation's well-being. But the figurative language chosen by Rist to describe the cure is more convincing than the vague phrases of

¹ Sir Thomas Aston at the death-bed of his wife. By John Souch (in the Manchester Art Gallery).

² *Das friedewünschende Teutschland. Der dritter aufzug*, Goedeke und Goetze (Rist, *Dichtungen*, pp. 74 et seq.).

his imitator. After the 'Emplastrum Lugae, welches trefflich wol bindet' has been refused, the question is asked: 'Was dünket dich denn bei dem Emplastro Unionis, welches nur gar ein wenig zusammenhält, und demnach nicht gar so stark ist als das vorige?'¹ These were matters of the moment at the time when Rist was writing, and the simple latinized phrase sustained the image of the charlatan. '... ich heile die Kranckheiten gantzer Konigreiche, Fürstenthümer, Republiken, Länder und Städte',² from the anonymous play, at once destroys the illusion; the dramatist hovers uncertainly between metaphor and abstraction; his device is unbalanced and incomplete, for he runs short of images to represent the thought. Even in the sub-plot there is the same uncertainty, and here it has more serious stylistic consequences. The peasant, stirred to animosity against the charlatan, comes to his booth feigning toothache, and the doctor diagnoses 'political trouble'.³ His biting of the doctor's hand has no clear significance; such a peasant-figure remains a compromise, and it is inevitable, in spite of his surprise on being confronted by Peace and the figure of Justice, that his speech should almost immediately take on the colour of the allegory.⁴ In Rist's *Irenaromachia*, *Friedewinschendes* and *Friedejauchzendes Teutschland*, the scheme is on the whole more carefully devised and the effect usually more satisfying.⁵

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 77. It is significant that Mars introduces Ratio Status.

² *Ratio Status*, p. 14.

³ *Ratio Status*, pp. 16-17.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*, pp. 46 et seq. A somewhat threadbare allegory is built up on the same theme in the anonymous play *Der von Prinz Eugenio und Duc de Marlebourg Curirte Ludovicus der XIV. König in Franckreich und Navarra: in einer lustigen Opera betrachtet von einem aufrichtigen Teutschen*. *Erdruckt In Siegeland* MDCCVII. Louis XIV and his ally Emanuel of Bavaria are covetous of the rich wines of Spain. They gain possession of these with the aid of the Cardinal Portocarrero who cunningly prevails upon the dying King of Spain to name the Duke of Anjou as his successor. But the three monarchs soon indulge to excess, and their banquet is followed by the most violent sickness. Stages in the defeat of the French are boldly suggested by the announcement of names of battles and forfeited provinces, and the monarchs succumb to repeated attacks of nausea. The resources of the operatic stage are apparently used for two contrasting scenes—one in which Louis is shown at a sumptuous table in Versailles, and the other, depicting the gloomy vault of the magician, in which the same monarch, on a three-legged stool, awaits the prediction of the fortunes of his armies. The god Mars appears, ushering in the period of war and suggesting the coming defeat by destroying the French lilies. Louis is tormented in his sleep by the apparition of the dead Duke of Luxembourg and the ghosts of Richelieu and Mazarin. With these elements of the supernatural and the allegorical are mingled attempts at individual characterization. The two great champions of the allies, Prince Eugene and the Duke of Marlborough, are perhaps intentionally lacking in elaboration, but the three monarchs, the wise and sarcastic servant, even Madame de Maintenon with her attempts to revive her royal lover's passion by magic means, have all a firm footing in life; the allegory is thus disturbed.

⁵ Willi Flemming (*Deutsche Lit. in Entwicklungsreihen, Barockdrama*, vi, 125) finds the last play less satisfying than the earlier ones. 'Vor allem aber wird Teutschland bloß als Allegorie gefaßt.' I am left in some uncertainty about Flemming's attitude to the allegorical in Rist's plays, for he says, while reviewing the *friedewinschendes Teutschland* (*loc. cit.*, p. 124), 'Besonders gunstig wirkt sich aus, daß Teutschland nicht als tote Allegorie gefaßt ist, sondern als Typus des Deutschen vermenschet wurde. So verstehen wir sie un-

When Rist introduces peasants and common people they generally retain their character, speaking and acting, it is true, not as individuals, but as representatives of common thoughts, aspirations and reactions. There is in Rist little or no intention of an explicit representation of actual, unique experience, and the characterization is kept general—for the positive and perfectly sound ethical reason that the dramatist wishes to reach as many of his audience as he can. In the 'Vorbericht an den aufrichtigen Teutschen Leser' in his *Friedewünschendes Teutschland*, he refers to the work of his literary guide, *Philander von Sittewald* of Moscherosch and 'quotes': 'Ist einer Irgend ohngefähr hie getroffen? Er schreibe es nicht dem armen Philander (oder Wahremund) zu, sondern sich selbst und seinem eigenem Willen und Wesen!' and then continues: 'Unter die Sausewinde sind auch zu zehlen alle die Geckshäuser welche auß eigenem Laßdunckel oder ingebildeter Hoffarth sich für die jenige Leute außgeben, die sie doch in Wahrheit nicht sind . . . verläugnen . . . ihre ehrliche Eltern . . . verändern ihre Namen, wollen mit Gewalt Ritters und Cavallire heissen.' That Rist, though a scholar with some considerable mastery of technique, was ready to give his actors some scope for improvisation,¹ is probably a further indication that he had no very rigid plan of character and no essential elaboration of incident—that he sought above all a clear and simple suggestion of the lives of ordinary people in his Zwischenspiele, the groundwork (but only that!) of a comic action, covering as wide a space as possible and boasting no nice superstructure, all subordinated to the service of his higher ethical plan.

It seems in general true that Johann Rist was constantly mindful of the larger issues. To seek and to reveal the broad vision of life in his time, its suffering and confusion and the great forces involved in his country's destiny—this was the cherished principle that inspired Rist's work. Unessential detail would have obscured the vision, and the things which were seen and meant as interpretation would by unwise and lavish use have usurped the centre of interest and cluttered his stage with an incoherent and meaningless mass. To hold and focus the spectators' minds upon the large theme he suggests that music shall be played.² And it is

mittelbar, fühlen mit, ohne erst jene intellektuelle Umschaltung vornehmen zu müssen wie bei der bloßen Allegorie'; and shortly afterwards, having praised the *Zwischenspiel*: 'Der allegorische Charakter wurde demnach eingehalten, den irgendwelche zusammenhanglose Burleske gestört hatte.' Otto Heins takes an altogether more reasonable view (*loc. cit.*, p. 77).

¹ 'Es ist nichts muhsamers, als in solchen Handlungen an gewisse Reden und Wörther sich binden zu müssen, dagegen nichts lustigers noch anmuthigers, als wenn man frei mag Reden, insonderheit wo die Spieler guhtes Verstandes sind und von dem rechten Zweck nicht leicht abweichen.' (Vorbericht, *Friedewünschendes Teutschland*.)

² *Das friedewünschendest Teutschland, Ende der ersten Handlung* (p. 26).

no mere love of outward show that bids him use the device of the tableau, in which an epitome of life is mimed without words and gains immensely in impressiveness because it is shown and felt not as a fragment of the tangible world of experience but as a complete picture, an intense and magnificent summary.

W. F. MAINLAND.

LONDON.

NOTES ON SOME UNPUBLISHED PAPERS OF REINHARD JOHANNES SORGE; A CONTRIBUTION RELATING TO THE GENESIS OF EXPRESSIONISM

SUFFICIENT work has now been done on the early Expressionist writers in Germany to make clear the general nature of this movement at the time when it first began to make itself felt as a potent force in the spiritual life of the nation. We have therefore a fairly true picture of the contribution to Expressionism of such writers as Heym, Stadler and Trakl, in whose work some tendencies in German literature from about 1910 are reflected. As yet, however, little research has been carried out on what may be called the prenatal period of Expressionism.¹

Reinhard Johannes Sorge is remembered chiefly because of his play *Der Bettler*, which, first conceived² in September 1911, was completed in January 1912. Not only does Sorge reveal himself in *Der Bettler* as the poet 'der zweifellos als der erste in Deutschland die Form ertastet hat, die man später "expressionistisch" taufen sollte',³ but also as the first bearer of Expressionist ideas and ideals in general. There is much of Sorge still unpublished which throws light on the embryonic development of the Expressionist ideal in the years before *Der Bettler*.⁴ Except in a few isolated cases nothing has been published that Sorge wrote previous to 1910. The works written between 1910 and *Der Bettler* have been made public⁵ and also those belonging to his later years.

The MSS. indicate that Sorge began imaginative writing in earnest in 1908 when he was seventeen years old. Before this year there are only some poems in the traditional style. To 1908 belongs however 'Kinder der Erde; eine episch-dramatische Dichtung', which represents one of Sorge's first steps along the road that was to lead to *Der Bettler*. Much is mere imitation. There are unmistakable echoes of *Faust I*, and Sorge adopts, though inconsistently, the spelling used by George.⁶ This work

¹ Cf., however, Ferd. Jos. Scheider, *Victor Hadwiger* (1878-1911). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Expressionismus in der deutschen Dichtung der Gegenwart, Halle, 1921.

² Cf. *Unser Weg* by Susanne M. Sorge, München, 1924, p. 13.

³ Julius Bab, *Richard Dehmel*, Leipzig, 1926, p. 311.

⁴ For permission to examine and make use of works to be found in the Nachlass, I am indebted to the great kindness of Frau S. M. Sorge, the poet's widow.

⁵ *Der Jüngling. Die frühen Dichtungen*, edited by Frau S. M. Sorge, München, 1925.

⁶ This seems to suggest that there has been some error made in the attempt to trace Sorge's first acquaintance with the work of George. Frau Sorge (in *Unser Weg*) associates it with 1911 and Martin Rockenbach (*Reinhard Johannes Sorge*, Leipzig, o.J.) attributes it to 1910.

consists of four parts, Frühling, Sommer, Herbst and Winter, and of conversations mainly between *Der Alte* and *Der Jüngere*. The former is seeking an answer to the 'welträtsel' and he finds it, on the advice of his younger friend, by surrendering himself to the wider experience of life. In the words of *Der Jüngere* to him in this connexion we find significant stress upon 'Geist', which plays such a large part in Expressionism proper:

Da lösen sich des geistes irdsche Fesseln
Die Seele schweift hinaus ins weite all,
Durchfliegt so schnell die hohen sonnenraume,
Des gottlichen lichtetes unendlichen schwall
Verwirklicht werden alle deine Traume
Und alles wissen scheint dir hohler schall
Du schwebst gleich einem Gotte in den hohen
Das hohe und das tiefe kannst du sehen.

The play closes with a eulogy of 'Geist' in a passage which to-day may be regarded as prophetic:

O wie mein geist in heisser Sehnsucht brennt
Die Tore aufzureissen und voll Mut
Mich froh zu wagen in die Geistesflut
Vom Geist getragen auf und ab zu wallen
Indessen Geistesstimmen mich umschallen
Ein ewig Meer das nimmermehr versiegt.

Further we find in this early work Sorge awakening to the desire to struggle with the mystery of life:

So dehnt sich vor mir denn ein weites Feld
Dass ich durchforschen muss ohn Rast und Ruh
Das grosse tiefe Ratsel dieser Welt,
Bis mir der Tod einst drückt die Augen zu.

This emerging earnestness in the face of life, this search for direction and for the nature and aim of existence, which were to culminate in *Der Bettler*, described by him as a 'Sendung', find striking expression when he says of one of his works:¹

Und ist auch dieses Buch ein zages Tasten
Und suchen nach dem Weg, den mir ein ehern
Gesetz in meiner Brust befiehlt zu wandern
Mein Leben lang.²

It is clear that in these very early documents Sorge is trying to wrestle with the problem of existence; he is seeking to define his own position and duties. In *Der Bettler* he says: 'einer muss wieder für uns alle nachsinnen'; the mission of the poet, thus defined, begins to emerge in these passages. Just as a line leads from *Der Bettler* to full Expressionism, so too it may be said to go back to these fragments of 1908. The Expressionist ideal is beginning to assert itself. Sorge in the same year evolved

¹ 'So etwas wie Philosophie', Heft 1, 1908, MS.

² Added later, October 1909.

ideas which come nearer still to Expressionism. He sums up two prevailing conceptions of existence.¹ One he defines as 'die Auffassung der ziemlich egoistischen Sich-Selbst-Vervollkommnung in der Annahme eines späteren egoistischen Weiterwirkens'. The other is the 'Auffassung der selbstlosen Hingabe an alle, zur Lösung des Problems, selbst mit Gefahr einer Nicht-Auferstehung.' He believes that the true view is the second and he adds: 'Diese Auffassung verlangt ausserdem noch etwas grosses vom einzelnen: den vollkommenen Opfermut.' This conception stands very close to Sorge's view of the mission of the poet as 'die grosse Weltgüte' (in *Der Bettler*) and leads over to the Expressionist 'Opfergedanke' which is one of the corner-stones of the movement.

The year 1908 was one of tremendous poetic activity for Sorge.² In this year, one can say, he awoke to ideas and emotions which must be regarded as prenatal stages of Expressionism. It is therefore a year of great importance for German literature. We can take leave of his work during this year by quoting a fragment which is of superlative importance for the history of Expressionism. The whole of the Expressionist conception of 'Geist' and all that this factor meant for German literature from about 1912 to the end of Expressionism about 1925 is summed up in this wonderful passage:

Manchmal ist mir so stark, so jauchzend froh ums Herz, unter den Klängen einer jubelnden Musik scheine ich dahinzuschliessen auf kleinem Nachen durch schäumende Fluten des Geistes und es ist mir, als tauche er oft unten in ein Wellental und versinke er im Sprühen des Geistes, dann aber als schwingt er sich auf und als türme er über Schaumwellen dem Lichte entgegen.³

1909 and 1910 brought for Sorge new and far-reaching experiences, as for example the 'Johannes-Erlebnis'.⁴ Sorge continues in the 'Gedanken über verschiedene Dinge' MS. his ideological searches. These were written under the influence of Nietzsche, as is indicated by such sentences as: 'Schwächere Geister werden nirgend lange verweilen, sie haben nicht die Kraft, beharrlich in die Tiefen zu dringen', and: 'Gebietarisch ist alles Leben', etc. He widens his dramatic field,⁵ and for the first time he defines for himself his position regarding his treatment of a given theme.⁶

¹ 'Warum leben wir?' 1908, MS.

² Besides the works already mentioned cf. MSS. 'Namenloses Drama', 'Novellistische Versuche', 'Die Alte Eiche' (drama), etc.

³ Written at the end of the booklet containing the 'Namenloses Drama'. It therefore belongs probably to 1908.

⁴ This experience cannot be dealt with here in full, but it has an importance similar to the 'Maximin-Erlebnis' for George and it finds poetical expression in the unpublished Märchen 'Vom Schmetterling und seiner Wunderblume.' Also cf. *Unser Weg*, pp. 22 ff.

⁵ Cf. the 'Indisches Drama' of which only the plan exists with its (for Expressionism) so significant and prophetic figure, 'die verhüllte Gestalt'.

⁶ In the Nachwort to his *Ergänzung des Lessing'schen Fragments 'Spartakus'*, March 1910.

He concludes that he must approach any subject along entirely subjective lines. The importance of this view for Expressionism is seen not only in Sorge's later rejection of the treatment by Hardt and Vollmoeller of legendary subjects¹ but also in the whole approach of the later Expressionists to the subject.² The 1908 fragments, we saw, represented the first steps in the awakening of a new and wider type of experience than that prevalent in German literature in these years; in 1909-10 he becomes conscious of the need definitely to break with the past and tradition. The world of Expressionism is obviously fast approaching.

The poems, seven in all, which bear the title *Eines Narren Narrenlieder*,³ and belong likewise to 1910, reveal new tones in German poetry and anticipate much of the Expressionist poetry proper. In them we find the rhapsodic form entering poetry, uncontrolled, incoherent exclamations invade and interrupt the rhythm, and, above all, the new cosmic experience which underlies almost the whole of Expressionist view of life comes to the fore.⁴ All these features are found in 'Des Narren Sturmlied':

Nun hört des Narren Lied,
Des Narren Lied in der Nacht,
In der Nacht, in der Nacht
Bei Sturm und Wolkenflug....!
.....Holloho.....Holloho.....
Da werf' ich ab mein Gewand,
Mein rotes Narrengewand
Jauchzend wild im Sturm....
Und schwing ein Schwert in Händen,
Ein glitzend-gleissend Schwert.....
.....Holloho.....holloho.....
Hoch in die Mitternacht
Schwing ich mein glitzend Schwert...
.....
Und führ' ein Ross am Zaum,
Ein wildes wiehernd Ross
.....Holloho.....Holloho.....
Hoch in die Mitternacht
Baumt sich mein witternd Ross
.....Holloho.....
Der Welt—hei—der Welt
Der sinnlos eckeln Welt
Jauchz' ich da Ade:

¹ Cf. the 'Kritiker' scene in *Der Bettler* and the poem 'Zukunft' (in *Der Jüngling*, pp. 152-3).

² Cf. for example, the subjective approach of the Expressionists to antiquity (e.g. Hasenclever, 'Antigone', Werfel, 'Die Troerinnen').

³ The madness motif was much used by Sorge as by Expressionism in general. Cf. the Father (in *Der Bettler*) and the play 'Die Narren', MS.

⁴ The titles of these poems are: (1) Wie der Narr an Anfang singt. (2) Des Narren Lied vom guten Bruder Tod. (3) Des Narren Nachtlid. (4) Des Narren Trinklied. (5) Des Narren Sturmlied. (6) Des Narren Traumlied. (7) Des Narren Sterbelied. Of these all are MS. except no. 2, which was published in *Orplid*, 11 Jahrg., Heft 12. Hardt's *Tantris der Narr* was probably the underlying influence.

Über Wolken und Wind,
 Über Weiten und All
 Tragt im Sturm mich mein Ross.....
Halloh..... Halloho.....
 Hin zu den Tiefen,
 den dunklen Tiefen
 Wo die Seelen sich eimen,
 Ewig sich einen in
 Ewiger Heiligkeit...
Halloheihho.....
 So klang des Narren Lied,
 Des Narren Lied in der Nacht,
 In der Nacht, in der Nacht
 Bei Sturm und Wolkenflug.

The year 1910 saw in Sorge the real breakthrough of this cosmic Weltanschauung. In the same year, in July, we find in another poem¹ this cosmic element recurring but with the significant addition that man figures more prominently in the centre of it. Here we find the cosmos represented as in wild movement around an individual. This Barock-Expressionist feature makes the poem, which has the title 'Das Drama', one of great importance as a foretaste of the direction in which German poetry was to move in a few years' time:

Nackt wie nackte Welle
 Schau ich einen Menschen
 Am Meerufer liegen.
 Ihm zur Linken
 Starr aus Felsen
 Steilt eine Wand—
 Ihm zur Rechten
 Winddurchsungen dunkeln hochgereckte
 Stumme Cypressen—
 In die Stille
 In die Meeresstille tönt mein Machtwort
 Tönt mein mahnend Machtwort:

Mensch zum Menschen

Es bebt der Mensch empor
 Der wellennackte
 Lebensmächtig dringt aus tiefsten Quellen
 Was verhalten hallend in ihm schlief:
 Quillen Qualen, funkeln Ahneshellen
 Und aus Rosenschalen fluten Wellen
 Heller Freuden, die so trunken tief
 Leuchten lasst und schwellen
 Heissversteckte Gier alldies durchbebend
 Denn ich rief mein belebend
 Mahnend Machtwort:

Mensch zum Menschen

¹ MS.

Es reckt sich meine Hand
 Die schöpferisch gedehnte
 Was aus Gründen wuchs
 Grundend forme ich
 In lohenden Gesichtern
 Zu lohenden Gesichtern
 Zu wehzerwühlten, flammzerzuckten
 Gramzerherbten Menschengesichtern.
 Um sie forme ich
 In vulkanischen Schöpfermachten
 In purpurglutflackenden Krämpfen
 All' weltauszusinnende
 Gestaltende Gestaltungen
 Wahnsinnsgeburten
 Aus den Schattenklüften des All gegriffen
 Gezerrt aus den Dunkelheiten der Feuerwelten
 Meine mahnende Hand muht den Meissel.

Das Drama

Expressionism was essentially concerned more with the content of works of art than with the form. It is in this respect that it differs so fundamentally from Neo-Romanticism. In 1909 we find summed up in a few words of Sorge the change that was soon to come over the character of German literature when Expressionism established itself. In November of that year Sorge notes:¹ 'Vertiefung meiner Auffassung vom Werk des Lebens.' The tendency of his thought from 1908 on could likewise be summed up in the words which he uses as the title for a short essay: 'Über den Opfermut.'² He regarded, that is to say, his life as of value only in so far as he gave it to the service of humanity. This moral severity caused him to lose faith in the creations of his fellow-countrymen and to launch forth on a more earnest quest than that with which the Neo-Romantics had concerned themselves. He looked forward to a profound change in the life of mankind, for he regarded his own people as 'voll nächtlicher Beschwernis'.³ That a change was approaching was not only his desire but his conviction. We find this idea expressed in language of a cosmic intensity and suspense such as we find about the same time in the work of Heym:

Die in dem Tale wenden schon die Blicke
 Von Angst zerhöhet zu jenes Berges First,
 Wo schwere schwarze Wolke hoch gelagert
 Hochmütig thront, prunkend gehauft zu Macht.
 Schon zucken Blitze ihre ersten Zeichen—
 Bald hebt ein Sturm den Staub der gelben Strassen
 In Nacht von Nebel und in erste Tropfen—
 Dann frisst der Strahl der Häuser niedre Spreu.⁴

¹ Tagebuch, MS.

² 'So etwas wie Philosophie.'

³ *Nachgelassene Gedichte*, herausgeg. von Martin Rockenbach, Leipzig, Vier Quellen Verlag, 1925.

⁴ 'Gewitter' (Symbolisch) 19/7/11, MS. It should be noted that it was written before the appearance of George's 'Stern des Bundes' and is therefore independent of it.

About two months later he conceived the idea of a new 'Ich-Drama'.¹ This later received the title 'Der Bettler' and represents the first important Expressionist work, from the appearance of which the beginning of Expressionism is often dated. Our investigations indicate, however, that when his complete works come to be made public² it will be seen that Expressionism took root earlier than we had previously imagined.

R. H. THOMAS.

WIMBLEDON.

¹ As he called it in the MS. of the 1. Fassung.

² Their publication has already been planned. The date, however, has been postponed.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

ROBERT GAGUIN AND THE ENGLISH POETS, 1489-90¹

On 21 August 1489 Robert Gaguin, the distinguished scholar-diplomat and general of the order of the Maturins, left for England in the train of François de Luxembourg. The overt object of this embassy was to conclude a treaty of peace and alliance with Henry VII, but its real aim was rather to camouflage Charles' designs upon Brittany. For some time past Maximilian and Charles had been manoeuvring to gain control of the duchy; England, for strategic reasons, favoured Maximilian, and at the moment it seemed that he had won a decisive point by his marriage with the young duchess Anne. But the marriage had been solemnized by proxy only: a characteristic negligence which gave Charles his opening. His agents set to work to convince the girl that her union with the old 'king of the Romans' was void, since the consent of Charles, as her liege lord and guardian, had not been obtained; at the same time they pressed the attractions of the French king's person. Meanwhile Charles continued to profess his readiness to marry, as he had agreed, the daughter of Maximilian; and an embassy was sent to London to help divert suspicion.

When the Frenchmen were granted audience, Gaguin, their official spokesman, explained in one of his best orations that France desired peace solely that Charles might recover Naples, 'being now in the possession of a bastard slip of Aragon'. This pacifying bait was sauced with the added appeal of a crusade. Charles would not rest at Naples, 'till either he hath overthrown the empire of the Ottomans, or taken it in his way to paradise'. In conclusion, purely as a 'civil request', recognition was sought of Charles' right to dispose of the hand of his vassal of Brittany as he thought fit. But English diplomacy was equal to the occasion. It was politely suggested by chancellor Morton that Henry had as good a title to France as Charles to Naples. 'If therefore the French king shall consent, that the king our master's title to France, at least tribute for the same, be handled in the treaty, the king is content to go with the rest, otherwise he refuseth to treat.'

Nonplussed by this unexpected demand, the ambassadors retired to Paris for further instructions. André may continue the narrative: 'They

¹ For the facts here summarized see (i) R. Gaguin, *Epistole et orationes* (ed. L. Thuasne, *Bibl. litt. de la Renaissance*, tom. 2-3, Paris 1903), I, 77-87; (ii) F. Bacon, *History of King Henry VII* (in *Essays . . . with other writings*, London: Newnes, 1902), pp. 514-23; (iii) Bernard André, *Vita Henrici VII* (in J. Gairdner, *Memorials of Henry VII*, London: Rolls Series, 1858), pp. 56-7.

were sent to us again, bearing certain articles which our king found in no way satisfactory. Wherefore the said Gaguin was roused to fury and dashed off some insolent lines [*versiculos temerarie effudit*] against the king, beginning:

Siccine tam crebris frustra conventibus Anglos Quaerimus, etc.

(For, as I should have mentioned before, they had first [i.e. on their way back from Paris] treated of peace with our emissaries at Calais.) But the lord Giovanni Gigli of happy memory, a man most learned in things human and divine, made a witty satire and replied in the king's name to the orator. He, on account of the rich and splendid banquet, abounding in every kind of delicacy, with which our most gracious majesty welcomed the embassy, called the king a shepherd (*pastorem*): Gigli pleasantly countered:

If I am your shepherd and pastor, you should be cattle and sheep!
(*Si me pastorem, te decet esse pecus*),

with many other gibes. Then the lord Pietro Carmeliano of Brescia, famous poet and orator and most worthy king's secretary, in a witty poem (which I can not reproduce owing to his absence at this time) poured scorn to perfection on the sour French jester; to say nothing of the biting epigram of that most eloquent orator Cornelio Vitelli, which begins:

*Siccine purpureos incessis carmine reges?
Legati officio siccine functus abis?*

We ourselves also, being sealed of the poets' tribe, raved upon the fellow, not (as they) in a few lines, but in almost two hundred: truly there is nothing bolder than a bad poet! First, close on fifty heroic verses, commencing:

Phoebe pater, jam, Phoebe, veni: fas antra movere Delia.

Then elegiacs ('*Nestoris annosi*', etc.), and others which begin: '*Puppis ad Oenopiam*', etc. Others again in hendecasyllables ('*Cum tot sustineas*'), of which I give here the conclusion, for remembrance' or rather ostentation's sake:

*Miles gaudet equis, colonus agris,
Venator canibus, poeta musis:
Sic urit sua quemlibet voluptas.*

'Thus, hooted and hissed out by these and many like compositions, he departed in a great rage.'

Probably the length of André's effusion was its own death-warrant, but other pieces of this early flyting have been preserved in a manuscript of Trinity College, Cambridge (O 2. 53), which I now reproduce:

fol. 65^r

Petri Carmehani scribe Angh Carmen Responsum.

Conueniunt Gallos crebris conuentibus Angh
 Et pacem iusta condicione petunt.
 Set negat hanc Gallus: ahem insana libedo
 Imperii pacis federa sancta vetat.
 Dat pacem verbis, dat rebus denta cruenta, 5
 Et corde est semper dissona lingua sua
 Prelia quid iactas? validos fortesque Britannos
 Non nosti dominos, Galle superbe, tuos?
 Quis nescit Gallos, cum vincunt, vincere semper
 Perfidia insidijs fraudibus atque dolis? 10
 In socios ferrum nostros conuertis et ensis,
 Colla iugo vt subigat terra Britana tuo.
 Virginis incaute domineque parentibus orbe
 Nulla iura petis debita lege tibi.
 Nos populum nobis sociali federe uotum 15
 Tutamur: inepto est hoc pietatis opus:
 Te tenet impietas, tenet et tua seua cupido
 Intrepidumque ferens currus ad omne nephas.
 Desine, si sapias, placidos stimulare leones,
 Ne mestus vires comperiare suas. 20
 Angle, petis pacem frustra: nil amplius instes:
 Bella geras! pacem Gallia victa dabit.¹

fol. 65^v

Gaguinus Orator Gallus contra Anglos.

Siccine tam crebris frustra conuentibus Anglos
 Querimus et dubie pacis obimus iter?
 Credimus astute tricas dissoluere gentis,
 Quam retro ex nostris nullus amauit avus.
 Sic (michi persuasi) Francis consenciet Anglus, 5
 Cum dabit agniculis vbera seua lupa,
 Cum fonte ex uno cerua lupusque bibent.
 Tota ergo prorsus spe pacis abimus inanes,
 Multus et interijt nunc sine fruge labor.
 Tot vigiles curas sanctum mentitus amorem 10
 Perdere defunctis regibus, Angle, potes.

Ad Regem Anglie.

Sis licet ingratus nec quid sit gratia cures,
 Exul ope nostra victor ad arva redis:
 Et nunc excitas seua ad discrimina regna,
 In generum expectas proferat arma socer.² 15

Egidius Anglicus contra prefatum Gallum.

Siccine tam crebra per te mendacia fiunt,
 Galle, tibi quare credere nemo potest?
 Credimus ut sanctam tendis dissoluere pacem,
 Cum nos Gallorum nullus amauit avus.
 Sic (tibi persuade) fueris, cum, Galle, fidelis, 5
 Regibus et regnis tunc tibi pax requies,
 Vel quando ablata reddere cuncta velis.

¹ l. 3. libedo] = libido. l. 9. Gallos] MS. *gallus*. l. 11. In socios... conuertis] *Insocios... conuentis*. l. 12. subigat] *subiat*. Britana] sic (see below). l. 14. *Iura nulla petis nulla debita lege tibi*. l. 15. uotum] *inuotum*. l. 20. comperiare] apparently *comperrare* with one *r* deleted and *i* inserted above.

² l. 3. tricas] = trichas (see *du Cange*, s.v.). dissoluere] *dissolue*. l. 8. Tota ergo prorsus] *Totus erga prorsus* (*Totus* attracted to *Multus*, l. 9, and *erga* to *Tota*). l. 9. sine] *sue*. l. 14. regna] *regnis* (attracted to *redis*, l. 13). l. 15. In generum] *Ingeneru*.

Quid spes pax vel amor promissa? a pace recedis,
 Raro fidem solus perditur ergo labor.
 Abcessi nunquam sum quos amplexus amore,
 Sed semper socios federe suo meos. 10

Rex Anglie ad Gallum.

Non tua sed mea sunt que dicis arma iuuare,
 A me que proavi detinere tui:
 Hunc male dicis ope me superasse tua.
 Quod dous ipse velit, faciam vel pace vel armis, 15
 Iouis sub clipeo singula ferre peto.¹

Here is the 'response' of Pietro Carmeliano, followed by the original lines of Gaguin himself—obviously put second to show how closely they were echoed by 'Egidius'. This last can only be Giovanni Gigli or de Giglis, father of the better-known Sylvester who became bishop of Worcester. 'Egidius' is *Egidio* in Italian, but it also stands for *Giles* or *Gilles* (as a christian or surname);² and André describes Giovanni as '*Johannes de Gillis*'. The identification becomes certain when we notice that 'Egidius' answers, as it is stated of Gigli alone, '*nomine regio*'. The curious fact that André's quotation appears in neither Gaguin nor Gigli is clearly due to the copyist's desire to get both on to a single page.

There is little that is remarkable about any of the specimens. They are certainly not to be compared with the Italian *invectivae* of the fifteenth century, although Carmeliano, at least, is known to have composed a satiric epitaph on the king of Scotland in 1513,³ and was presumably versed in the art. Here, however, he contents himself with a blunt *we-are-better-than-you*! The 'just condition' of l. 2 refers to the English claim on France, his '*terra Britana*' (l. 12) is of course Brittany, and the 'heedless maid and orphaned lady' its duchess Anne. Gaguin's effort is most interesting for what Bacon terms its 'bitter libel' against Henry VII. The surviving quatrain charges Henry with ingratitude to France—a reference to the help he received when a fugitive at the court of Brittany—and accuses him of stirring up father-in-law (Maximilian) against son-in-law (Charles). One wonders how much Gaguin knew, for shortly after he wrote this Charles married Anne of Brittany! Gigli's reply carefully parodies each accusation, ending on a characteristically British note of piety—a note which infuriates her neighbours to this day.

One striking fact may be observed in André's account of this controversy: not one of the defenders of England which he mentions has an English name. André himself was French; Gigli, Carmeliano and Vitelli

¹ l. 9. soluis] *suas*. l. 10. Abcessi] = Abscessi (see *du Cange*, s.v. *abcindere*). l. 16. Iouis] *Euss*.

² E.g. Gilles de Corbeil = Egidius Corboliensis; Peter Gilles = Petrus Aegidius.

³ *Cambridge History of English Literature* (ed. 1932), II, 330.

were Italians. It is a reflexion on the state of England after the Wars of the Roses, as well as an important sidelight on the Tudor court. But one Englishman, we happen to know, did take up the pen on behalf of his sovereign, and his is a greater name than even Gaguin's—John Skelton, poet laureate. Skelton himself, in the catalogue of his works which forms part of the *Garland of Laurel*, mentions 'The Recule ageinst Gaguyne of the Frenshe nacyoun' (l. 1187); and there is a laughable comment on this earlier in the poem. Among the throng of literary giants who are to greet Skelton's entry into the Court of Fame he dryly inserts

... a frere of Fraunce men call sir Gagwyne,
That frownyd on me full angerly and pale. (374-75.)

It is most regrettable that the writer of the Trinity commonplace book failed to include in his selection the cause of this ferocious scowl.¹

Literary and political in origin, the quarrel did not long survive its occasion. When, a decade later, Gaguin published a small collection of his Latin verses,² he felt free to include in it (sig. D 5) the poem with which he had celebrated Charles' betrothal to the daughter of Maximilian: '*De Caroli dalphim et margarite filie Maximiliani sponsalijs / gratulatio.*' The reason is obvious: for just above (sig. D 2) there are some verses addressed, in a tone of significant modesty, to Carmeliano. They begin:

Vis petre ingenue quod de te sentio dicam
Dum me ornas varijs laudibus et tytulis?

In the same place Gaguin inserts a friendly quatrain to another of his attackers, Vitelli. Whether the pieces were written before or after the dispute, their publication in 1498 shows that the poets were enemies no longer. Even Skelton, shortly before he composed the *Garland*, was able to quote without animosity

maister Gaguine, the crownycler
Of the feytis of war
That were done in Fraunce.³

H. L. R. EDWARDS.

CAMBRIDGE.

SENECA'S FATALISM AND ELIZABETHAN TRAGEDY

For a long time it has been usual for English critics to blame Seneca for anything which they have not liked in Elizabethan Drama. Nowadays, however, there are a few who hesitate to attribute to the influence of the same writer the dramatic faults of plays as different as *Gorboduc*

¹ F. Brie's claim to have discovered part of Skelton's *Reculé* (*Englische Studien*, 1907, pp. 31-2) has been fully refuted by L. J. Lloyd (*Review of English Studies*, 1929, pp. 302-6).

² *Tractatus Roberti gaguini de puritate conceptionis*... [Parisii,] 22 November 1498.

³ *Why Come Ye Not To Court?*, ll. 715-17.

and *Titus Andronicus*. Yet even they are still content to hold him responsible for the pessimism expressed in the work of almost every dramatist of the time, whether 'classical' or 'popular'. Thus Mr T. S. Eliot writes, 'I subscribe to the observation of Cunliffe, "We have (in *King Lear*) Seneca's hopeless fatalism, not only in the catastrophe, but repeatedly brought forward in the course of the play".'

As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods;
They kill us for their sport.¹ (Selected Essays, p. 97.)

The exact nature of Seneca's influence is, no doubt, difficult to determine, but the question is of some importance in the study of West European Literature and one may perhaps be pardoned for examining briefly his opinions on fatalism. To suggest, as Mr Eliot and Professor Cunliffe do, that he accepted a philosophy of 'hopeless fatalism', and transmitted it to the English playwrights, is, I think, unfair to Seneca, and not wholly fair to the Elizabethans.

Seneca, like the other Roman thinkers, a moralist rather than a metaphysician, repeatedly affirms that all knowledge is useless which does not lead to virtue. Unlike the early Stoics he did not think dialectic worthy of serious attention, and he considered even Zeno's syllogisms a waste of time (v. *Epistulae Morales*, 82). 'Facere docet philosophia, non dicere', he writes to Lucilius (*Epp. Mor.* 20). His indifference to metaphysical consistency is shown by such passages as these:

Dicet aliquis: 'Quid mihi prodest philosophia, si fatum est? Quid prodest, si deus rector est? Quid prodest, si casus imperat?'... Quicquid est ex his, Lucili, vel si omnia haec sunt, philosophandum est (*Epp. Mor.* 16).

Et ante omnia ille (sapiens) quoque vitetur affectus... libido moriendi... vitae non odium sed fastidium, in quod prolabimur ipsa impellente philosophia, dum dicimus... 'Nullius rei finis est, sed in orbem nexa sunt omnia, fugiunt ac secuntur' (*Epp. Mor.* 24).

It is evident that, to him, the ethical implications of a theory were more interesting than its logical validity as such. It is safe to assume that his belief in Fate had no connexion with a philosophical theory of Possibility. What is more relevant is the attitude to life which he thought would result from such belief.

The following quotations show that, however pessimistic his personal outlook may have been, he had no doubt that the fatalist would naturally be patient, courageous and happy.

Fata nos ducunt, et quantum cuique restet, prima nascentium hora disposuit. Causa pendet ex causa, privata ac publica longus ordo rerum trahit. Ideo fortiter omne ferendum est; quia non, ut putamus, incidunt cuncta, sed veniunt.
(*De Providentia*, 5.)

¹ The choice of an example is unfortunate. The quotation implies that the gods take pleasure in human misery, and are not merely indifferent to it. The doctrine is one which Seneca would have repudiated.

Nihil indignetur sibi accidere sciatque illa ipsa, quibus laedi videtur, ad conservationem universi pertinere et ex us esse, quae cursum mundi officiumque consummant. Placeat homini, quicquid deo placuit. (*Epp. Mor.* 74.)¹

Itaque quicquid illi accidit, aequo animo sustinebit; sciet enim id accidisse lege divina, qua universa procedunt. (*Ibid.* 76.)

He is at pains to retain his belief in the efficacy of prayer, and he insists on the freedom of the individual to change his own character, the only freedom which Seneca, as a Stoic, regarded as important. 'Hoc regnum sibi quisque dat', says the Chorus of the *Thyestes* (l. 390). 'In mores fortuna ius non habet', he tells Lucilius (*Epp. Mor.* 36); and again, 'Sibi quisque dat mores, ministeria casus adsignat' (*ibid.* 47).

It is difficult for us who associate fatalism with such people as Jonathan Edwards and John Newton, to realize how such a point of view as Seneca's was ever possible. It may be that it was possible for him only because he was able to identify Fate with the divine government of the world. When he discusses the nature of God in the *Naturales Quaestiones* he uses the words 'fatum', 'providentia' and 'deus' as synonyms, e.g.

Vis illum (Jovem) fatum vocare? non errabis. Hic est ex quo suspensa sunt omnia, ex quo sunt omnes causae causarum. Vis illum providentiam dicere? recte dices. Est enim, cuius consilio huic mundo providetur, ut inconfusus eat, et actus suos explicet. (*Nat. Quaest.* II, 45.)

Fatalism of this kind cannot fairly be called 'hopeless'.

No doubt a large proportion of the many allusions to Fate in Elizabethan and Jacobean plays are dramatic, or merely conventional, and do not provide any indication of the author's point of view. Sometimes, however, the nature of the context is such as to suggest that the dramatist understood how often Senecan fatalism was a 'disguised imperative', an exhortation to patience and courage. Such, perhaps, are the many occasions on which a character tries to console his friends for their misfortunes by telling them that they were inevitable, an argument common enough for Marston to satirize it in *Antonio and Mellida* in the person of Pandulpho. In Tourneur's *Atheist's Tragedy*, from which several examples of this use of fatalism might be chosen, it is argued that it is an offence against Nature to grieve for what is inevitable as well as being irrational,

But has she (i.e. Nature) purposed anything for nothing?
What good receives this body by your grief?
Whether is't more unnatural not to grieve
For him you cannot help with it, or hurt
Yourself with grieving, and yet grieve in vain? (II. iv.)

However, such arguments will perhaps seem too natural to be taken as

¹ Seneca's attitude is not unlike that of some of the early Taoists of China, who tried to delight in whatever happened to them.

evidence of a Senecan conception of Fate, except when, as in the above passage, or as in Chapman, they are found along with other indications of Stoic influence.

The same might be said of the reflexions on Fate by characters who are about to face danger or death. Hamlet, who has just said to Horatio, 'But thou wouldst not think how ill all's here about my heart', tries to prepare himself for his duel with Laertes by considering that 'There's a special providence in the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, 'tis not to come; if it be not to come, it will be now; if it be not now, yet it will come: the readiness is all.' (v. ii.)

Caesar, who also has forebodings, speaks similarly,

What can be avoided
Whose end is purpos'd by the mighty gods?
.....
It seems to me most strange that men should fear;
Seeing that death, a necessary end,
Will come when it will come. (ii. ii.)

Ever in so late a play as Nabbes's *Hannibal and Scipio* the heroine gains courage to commit suicide by reflecting that

Whatso'ere decree
Is written in the adamantine tables
Of Destiny, we must subscribe to. (iii. iv.)

Another kind of reference to Fate, which occurs frequently, is that in which someone who has committed a crime makes Fate the excuse.

It is not I, but urgent destiny...
Enforceth my offence, (iii. i.)

says Tamyra in Chapman's *Bussy d'Ambois*. So Sextus, in Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*,

Back! yet thy fame
Is free from hazard, and thy style from shame.
O Fate! thou hast usurped such power o'er man
That where thou plead'st thy will, no mortal can. (iv. iii.)

There is a remarkable example of this in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. Wendoll, the villain, decides for or against belief in Fate as he decides for or against committing the crime he is considering,

Hast thou the power, straight with thy gory hands
To rip thy image from his bleeding heart?
.....
And yet I must. Then, Wendoll, be content;
Thus villains, when they would, cannot repent.

A little while after he changes his mind, and his belief in his freedom revives, only to disappear again,

What sad destiny
Hath such command upon my yielding thoughts?
I will not. Ha! Some fury pricks me on,
The swift Fates drag me at their chariot-wheel,
And hurry me to mischief. (ii. iii.)

The comment of Shakespeare's Edmund on this type of excuse is too well known to be worth quoting; Marston's opinion was similar. In *Sophonisba* the Carthaginian Senate tries to force the heroine to marry Syphax.

Cartholon: The gods foresaw, 'tis fate we thus are forc'd.

Sophonisba: Gods naught foresee, but see, for to their eyes

Naught is to come or past; nor are you vile

Because the gods foresee. (II. i.)

Thus he denies the worth of fatalism as an excuse, just as he has derided its value as a consolation. In these circumstances, some interest attaches to his reference to Seneca in the *Malcontent*, however unfair it may be,

Bilioso: Marry, I remember one Seneca, Lucius Annaeus Seneca—

Pietro: Out upon him! he writ of temperance and fortitude, yet lived like a voluptuous epicure, and died like an effeminate coward. (III. i.)

It is hardly necessary to say that Seneca would have agreed with Sophonisba; this kind of allusion, at least, cannot be attributed to Stoic influence, although it shows that the Elizabethans sometimes used their beliefs in the same way as Seneca. That they did so often realize that they could be utilized to prevent anything, whether misfortune, or the prospect of death, or the consciousness of guilt, from troubling them, suggests that their fatalism was no more metaphysical in character, and can no more be called a philosophy of despair, than Seneca's can.

C. F. BECKINGHAM.

HOUGHTON, HUNTS.

A STAGE DIRECTION IN THE NEW SHAKESPEARE 'HAMLET'

Professor Dover Wilson, in his edition of *Hamlet* (II, ii, 158) inserts a stage direction so as to make Hamlet overhear Claudius, Gertrude and Polonius plotting to employ Ophelia as a decoy. The ground for this was prepared by an examination of Shakespeare's dramatic intentions,¹ and editorial problems.² The change did not find favour with some reviewers, but there was no modification of his view in *What Happens in Hamlet*.³ The books on Shakespeare that have appeared since then have not taken serious notice of Dover Wilson's departure, and Granville-Barker's *Preface to Hamlet*⁴ frankly condemns it. I suggest that in subsequent editions the stage direction should be dropped.

Professor Dover Wilson claims that, in making this change, he is only restoring the true text. Let us examine the evidence.

¹ *Six Tragedies* (1930), p. 82.

² *M.S. of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'* (1934), pp. 22-85, 186.

³ (1935). Nor, as I understand, in the second edition just now published (1937).

⁴ Granville-Barker, *Prefaces*, series III, pp. 200-1.

If, on the Elizabethan stage, Hamlet had been shown overhearing the plot, one fails to understand how that stage practice could have died out. Granville-Barker points¹ out how Rowe, not copying Q_1 , was able to restore a stage direction owing to the existence of a stage tradition dating from Shakespeare's time and alive at the Restoration. Overhearing is a peculiarly obtrusive device on the stage and could not have been overlooked.

Dover Wilson blames editors for their interest in Q_1 , and neglect of Q_2 .² So far as fixing the text is concerned, the charge is just; but in the matter of stage directions, as he himself admits, Q_1 retains its importance for the simple reason that it was based on notes taken at performances of the play.³ If Granville-Barker's theory of Q_1 is correct,⁴ this argument implies that the absence of the stage direction in Q_2 is not by mistake; but even otherwise the plain 'Enter Hamlet' of Q_1 is fatal to Dover Wilson's theory.⁵

The absence of the entry in F_1 cannot be explained away as easily as Professor Dover Wilson imagines. The scribe who used discretion in making the transcript from the Globe prompt-book had seen the play performed and could not have left out such important and unusual stage business.⁶ The stage directions omitted by him are such as are latent in the dialogue itself.⁷ The argument that prompt-books contained marginal entries for the guidance of actors behind the scenes⁸ who had to get ready cannot apply to the transcript made by this scribe, and so the second scribe and the compositor could not have dropped the entry if it existed. The errors of the second scribe⁹ and the compositor were evidently not due to the use of discretion; and if there had been such a misuse of discretion, Hemminge and Condell were sufficiently conversant with the stage practice¹⁰ to have detected it.

The burden of proof lies with the editor who claims that something was in the text, and so its absence in F_1 , Q_1 and Q_2 cannot be dismissed as insignificant.

Professor Dover Wilson asserts that many things cannot be explained

¹ *Ib.* p. 162.

² *MS.*, p. 18 (vol. 1).

³ *Ib.* pp. 20, 160, 179-80, 185-6.

⁴ *Prefaces*, III, 200.

⁵ On the platform stage an announcement like 'But look where sadly the poor wretch comes...' (II, ii, 168) means that the actor has become visible to the audience. Hamlet takes time to walk up to the stage. This itself is a double entry.

⁶ Cf. *MS. of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet'*, I, 33-6, 68-77.

⁷ The actor or reader can supply them from the text itself. Cf. *MS.*, II, 184-5.

⁸ *MS.*, II, 186.

⁹ He gave heed to stage directions. Dover Wilson makes much of the omission of 'Leaps in after Laertes' (*MS.*, II, 185-6); but the stage business is clear from 'Be burned quick with her and so will I' (v, i, 273).

¹⁰ They did not remember the readings and so F_1 is defective that way. Cf. *MS.*, p. 65.

without such a stage direction, but I am inclined to feel that it is purely gratuitous.

Hamlet's use of words like 'fishmonger' and 'carrion'¹ to Polonius needs no far-fetched explanation. When Hamlet seemed to be rising, Polonius connived at the growth of love between Hamlet and Ophelia, but now that such an alliance is likely to displease the powers that be, he locks her up, intending, doubtless, to dispose of her in a better market. Hamlet hints that Polonius is treating her as flesh for sale, and incidentally lends colour to the theory that Ophelia is the cause of his madness, but there is no bitterness: Polonius is only a 'tedious old fool'.

Coming to the so-called nunnery scene, Dover Wilson's stage direction creates problems instead of solving them. If Hamlet had overheard the plot, the very sight of Ophelia kneeling in an unusual place to which he had been 'closely' 'sent for'² must have reminded him of it; but Dover Wilson assures us that the sight of Ophelia reminds him of nothing except 'the pangs of disprized love',³ that he converses with her for some time oblivious of the fact that they are being overheard,⁴ and that the latter part of his talk is meant for the ears of Claudius and Polonius.⁵ Hamlet's indiscreet 'Those that are married, all but one, shall live' is explained as a deliberate threat,⁶ but Hamlet, who is anxious to throw Claudius and Polonius off the scent until the play is ready to catch the conscience of the king, would not have prematurely resorted to such tactics.

Dover Wilson's error is that he finds a break in Hamlet's thoughts at line 102. From 'To be, or not to be' right up to 'to a nunnery, go', it is one unbroken mental process.⁷ The forces of evil predominate, life is a meaningless submission to torture. If death were the end suicide would have been an effective escape from the clutches of evil, but there is the evidence of the ghost. If it was his father, punished for dying in sleep through no fault of his own, then injustice reigns in the world beyond death. If the ghost was not his father, then it means that Satan's emissaries are powerful enough to extend his conquests. Either way Satan reigns supreme in the world beyond death. In an unweeded garden there is no use attempting to remove the grass blade by blade, it has to be rooted out. Hamlet wants to baffle the author of evil. To commit suicide is to play into the hands of the enemy. As hunters with slings and arrows drive the elephant in the direction where the pitfall has been prepared for him, Satan by making life a torture is driving man to suicide and eternal

¹ *What Happens in 'Hamlet'*, p. 105.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 130.

⁷ Granville-Barker, *Prefaces*, III, 79.

² *Ib.* p. 125.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 131.

³ *Ib.* p. 128.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 134.

perdition. In rejecting the death-wish, however, man must not go to the opposite extreme and marry, because all men are predestined to be damned. The more we multiply, the greater the victory of Satan. Virtue cannot so inoculate our old stock as to counteract the downward pull of original sin. The only way to defeat Satan is to refuse to breed.¹ The illusion that the attraction of the sexes is something noble is itself caused by Satan; all love is lust. Ophelia should not have believed that he, or any man for that matter, is capable of love.² When she takes out the trinkets from her bosom, and behaves in the fascinating way that women instinctively do, Hamlet finds it necessary to deny the reality of his past romance with emphasis and even harshness. She is, though she knows it not, the tool of Satan. Let not women ruin themselves and others with their beauty—real or artificial.³ The popular belief that physical beauty emanates from the beauty of the soul is false, beauty attracts lust and then surrenders to it. Gertrude was beautiful and so she fell. If Ophelia wants to save herself, let her, before she is deprived of her defensive armour of chastity, go to a nunnery.

Dover Wilson's insistence that 'nunnery'⁴ means 'brothel' is not really needed for his own explanation.⁵

C. NARAYANA MENON.

BENARES.

AN ATTACK ON FOSCOLO

In one of the volumes already published of the National Edition of Foscolo's works an autobiographical fragment is printed in a footnote. This contains the following words:

Questi miei giovanili scritti ho citato, e altri ne citerò, affinché chiunque vuole accusarmi li raffronti innanzi tratto; e se troverà una sola parola che per venti anni nelle mie opinioni politiche si contraddica, io mi confesserò colpevole del delitto ascrittommi da un giornale d'Inghilterra intitolato *L' Italico*, ove sta scritto (No. 1) ch' io vendeva la penna a' doni di Bonaparte..

The article alluded to appeared in the first number of that very interesting Italian periodical published in London in 1813 and 1814, *L' Italico*,

¹ Modern psychology has shown that the sense of the sin of Eve, of the mother's fall, of guilt, melancholy, the suicidal impulse and the exaltation of celibacy are inter-related.

² The key to Hamlet's conduct at Ophelia's grave is that he realizes he *loved* her. He thinks her suicide was due to disappointed love and blames himself for not having followed his instinct, because, being convinced of 'a divinity that shapes our ends', he now feels that men have only to follow impulse to defeat Satan.

³ Dover Wilson's explanation of III, 1, 107-8 is wrong. Hamlet regards virtue and beauty as mutual irreconcilables, beauty being a temporary loan given by Satan to women with which to entice men to eternal perdition.

⁴ *What Happens in 'Hamlet'*, p. 134.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 133.

⁶ Ediz. Naz. delle *Opere* di Ugo Foscolo, VIII, 334, Firenze, 1933.

Giornale politico, scientifico e letterario da una Società d' Italiani.¹ In the December 1812 number of the *Quarterly Review* there had been a highly favourable review of Foscolo's *Ultime Lettere di Jacopo Ortis*,² and it is to contradict this praise that the Italian reviewer indulges in a ferocious *stroncatura* of the work itself ('non solo così frivolo e leggiero, ma falso e pericoloso') and a personal attack on Foscolo. The following quotations will suffice to show the tone of the article and will reveal the fact that the anonymous reviewer had known Foscolo personally:

Se creder si dovesse ai sentimenti ch' egli dipinse con colori robusti, ma rozzi, nelle sue lettere, in riguardo allo stato politico dell' Italia, e di Venezia in particolare, com' era al tempo in cui egli scrivea, non si potrebbe far a meno di stimarlo come un franco patriotta—un uomo il di cui cuore non palpitava che pel suo paese—i di cui principj erano puri, fermi, indipendenti—a cui stava a petto la libertà della Patria. E in fatti chi avrebbe creduto altrimenti?... Noi, stessi, in que' tempi burrascosi, balzati quà e là dal turbine de' giornalieri politici sconvolgimenti dell' Italia, ebbimo la sorte d' incontrar sovente questo giovane autore—e sovente l' udimmo fulminare dalla Tribuna d' un circolo costituzionale (non Lyceum come dice il *Quarterly Review*) in Milano, Bologna, Venezia, ed in altre poche città, delle ardenti filippiche contro l' aristocratico sistema della casa d' Austria in particolare, e di tutti i regni in generale, in uno stile d' improvvisa eloquenza, per niun altro motivo rimarchevole, che per le violenti e sanguinose dottrine cui serviva ad inculcare, e per il linguaggio sconnesso, rozzo, difettivo, col quale veniano queste disseminate.

Foscolo, dotato di un anima ardente, cui la savia mano d' una ben condotta educazione non domò mai, e vittima di violente passioni, lanciaosi nel vortice rivoluzionario senza punto curarsi, nè di che farebbe in una situazione per lui sì novella; nè quai passi seguirebbe in una carriera tanto pericolosa e nociva. Ecco donde originò quell' incessante miseria che lo perseguitò mai sempre—che lo rese l' uomo più infelice della terra; e lo costrinse a correre dalle più tumultuose taverne, alle più pubbliche tavole di Bassetta e Biribisso³ in Venezia e Milano, onde poter sussistere, ed al tempo stesso, scacciar la noja che mai sempre succede allo sfogo di violente passioni, ed acquietare la rabbia che gli attizzavano in seno, il disprezzo de' suoi compatriotti e la poca considerazione che di lui facevano i letterati. Questo accanito repubblicano, con una versatilità di principj, ch' è il distintivo delle anime sregolate, divenne in pochi anni, uno schiavo il più abietto di colui, che avea distrutto perfìn l' ombra della libertà della sua Patria. Immerso in una miseria estrema, fù soccorso da Monti, a cui fece bassamente la corte.

Now the question is, who was this anonymous enemy who so maliciously attacked the poet? The few critics⁴ who have touched on this incident state that it was Augusto Bozzi-Granville, one of the founders of the *Italico* and, after December 1813, its sole editor. Bozzi-Granville (of whom more may be learnt in his *Autobiography*, 1874) went to Italy in 1814 as a political emissary and met Foscolo in Milan. Their association at this time has been fully dealt with elsewhere, and I mention it only to

¹ For this matter see *L' Italico*, I, 63, May 1813; VI, 327, Dec. 1813; VII, 2, Feb. 1814, *Notizie*; IX, 359, Dec. 1814.

² The review is apropos of the appearance of the 1811 London Edition. It is unsigned, but indications leave me in no doubt that it is by William Stewart Rose.

³ 'Specie di giochi di sorte di moderna invenzione.'

⁴ An exception is Domenico Spadoni in 'U.F. Cospiratore' (*Studi su U.F.*, Pavia, 1927) who suggests Granville 'o un suo collaboratore'.

indicate that Foscolo, who certainly knew of the *Italic* article, received Granville in a way that would have been quite impossible had he believed him to have been the author of the spiteful attack. Before the danger of political implications had made him shy of the *Anglo-italo's* friendship, he had felt and shown sympathy with a man in whom he saw the engaging characteristics of Sterne's *La Fleur*.¹

On Granville's return to England he published a heartfelt editorial apology to Foscolo in the *Italic* (December 1814, p. 359) for which he was now sole responsible editor.

Un simile fallo commesso venne da chi scrisse l'articolo intorno all'edizione Inglese delle *Lettere di Jacopo Ortis*, inserito nel primo numero dell'*ITALICO*, prima che questo assunto avesse il nome mio, o divenuto fosse di mia sola proprietà. In quell'articolo, lo scrittore di esse lettere, il Signor Ugo FOSCOLO, è calunniato d'un modo osceno e scandaloso. Un' invidia maligna, od un' inimicizia secreta; ma certamente un' ingiustizia degna di gastigo, vi ha dettato delle linee di fiele.

I lettori dell'*Italic* aveano diritto ad un rischiaramento su d'un punto che tutti interessava, ed io avendo avuto la buona sorte di conoscere a fondo il degno soggetto di cui si parla durante l'ultimo mio viaggio in Italia, provo una piena compiacenza in proclamare al mondo esser egli del tutto diverso da quello, che nel *Giornale Italiano* di Londra, venne, ne' primi periodi di esso, dipinto.

The wording of this apology, quite apart from Foscolo's reception of Granville, seems to make it highly improbable that the latter was the author of the attack. Of the various anonymous contributors to the *Italic* I have been able to trace, the one most likely to have written the offending article was Filippo Pananti, the well-known author of the *Poeta di Teatro*. He was possibly more important than Granville in the *Italic* group until his departure for the Mediterranean, late in 1813, where he was captured and enslaved by Algerian pirates. He it was who wrote the first leading article of the paper and who contributed numerous essays and epigrams. The literary side was obviously his province, while Granville was responsible for the political and scientific articles. Could his antagonism to Foscolo have dated from that early meeting in Tuscany when he was implicated in the insurrectionary proceedings of the summer of 1799 and the poet, as an officer of hussars, was retreating north with the army of General Macdonald?² At any rate Pananti could well have observed Foscolo at Venice and probably Milan and Bologna 'in que' tempi burrascosi' as the author of the article claims, as he speaks of a recent visit to the North of Italy and specifically to Venice in a letter dated 1 March 1799.³ In politics he was a Liberal and speaks in the same

¹ v. Foscolo's letter to the Countess of Albany, 16 August 1814. *Epistolario*, II, 51, Le Monnier, 1853.

² *Giornale Storico*, LXXXIII, 96, 1924, and *Lettere inedite di U.F.*, p. 271, Tormo, 1873. For meeting with Pananti v. C. Antona-Traversi e A. Ottolini, *Ugo Foscolo*, I, 152, 1927.

³ *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, Serie V, t. III, p. 77.

letter with little sympathy of the ultra-republicans in Venice (amongst whom had been Foscolo) 'che hanno protestato altamente... nei circoli costituzionali'. Compare this last phrase with the words of the article 'e soventel' udimmo fulminare dalla Tribuna d' un circolo costituzionale'.

But nothing that we know, or that may be inferred, as to the direct relations between Foscolo and Pananti seems to warrant the ferocious tone of the article fourteen years after their meeting in 1799. To explain this we have to look further. Amongst those who took part in the violently polemical controversy that raged in 1809 and 1810 round the persons of Foscolo and Vincenzo Monti, and which finally broke their friendship, was Urbano Lampredi. It is not necessary to enter into the details of the controversy, but a few quotations from an article of Foscolo will show the kind of terms that existed between him and Lampredi.

Al Re della Lega de' ciarlatani letterari, Alto, Signor Urbano Lampredi. Alzatevi, e guardatemi in faccia una volta. Questa vostra è guerra da traditore... O Signor Lampredi, O Signor abate, o Signor ex-frate, ed anche sacerdote spretato... or, Signor Ex-frate pellegrino, etc., etc.¹

Whereas Lampredi was on the very worst possible terms with Foscolo we find he was a close friend of Pananti. In the 17th canto of his *Poeta di Teatro* (stanza xxvi) there are the following verses:

Mentre Lampredi ed io fummo a Sorese,
Dei Toschi versi il rapido concento
Ai vaghi ingegni amabile si rese.

In a note² to this passage the author states as follows:

Il Professor Lampredi uomo d' alto ingegno, di moltissima letteratura, buon mattematico, versatissimo nelle lingue dotte è stato qualche tempo, mentre io pur v' era professore di matematiche, a Sorese... leggiadro paese in Linguadoca.

My assumption is therefore that Filippo Pananti, who certainly disliked Foscolo's politics and who had opportunity to observe and dislike Foscolo's behaviour in Italy, was further moved to active hostility through his friendship with Lampredi. The *Italico* article is not by Bozzi-Granville, the man who spoke well of Foscolo in his autobiography, who sought him out in Milan after the article had been published, and later frequented Digamma Cottage, but is, I think, yet another document in the Lampredi polemics. Had the strictures not been contradicted, this last shaft might have done Foscolo untold harm.

M. Caraccio rightly states that 'La diffusion dans le public anglais de ces articles contradictoires, puisqu'il s'agit d'une revue rédigée en italien, fut fort restreinte';³ but he fails to add that it circulated precisely

¹ Ediz. Naz. delle *Opere* di U.F., vii, 296, Florence, Le Monnier, 1933.

² F. Pananti, *Il Poeta di Teatro*, I, 329, London, 1808.

³ A. Caraccio, *Ugo Foscolo*, p. 149, Paris, Hachette, 1934.

amongst those Italophiles who were to befriend Foscolo on his arrival in England soon after. It was read by Lord Holland, Roscoe, Finch, Mathias, Miss Wilbraham, Col. Leake, to mention only a few. What if his reputation on landing on our shores had been that of a gambler, a flatterer, a rabid republican who threw over his principles, the author of inferior and even immoral books? It was Bozzi-Granville to whom Foscolo was beholden for the contradiction of these strictures, so that the former's reputation as the villain of the episode is unfortunate and unjust.

E. R. VINCENT.

CAMBRIDGE.

'DEUTSCHE KLASSIK UND ROMANTIK'

The argument of Strich in his book, *Deutsche Klassik und Romantik*, that the spirit of Classicism is the perfection of completion and that of Romanticism eternal striving for the unattainable is now well known. Strich says:

Vollendung hat das Ende ihrer eigenen Möglichkeiten voll erreicht und ist darum erhaben über alles Ende... Aber ewig ist auch, was unendlich ist, was niemals enden kann, weil es niemals vollendet sein kann, was niemals in sich selber selig ist, sondern immer über sich selbst und aus sich selbst heraus treibt.¹

The first part of the statement can be applied to Classicism: 'denn der klassische Mensch vermag, was ewig und das heisst für ihn: vollendet ist, schon in der Zeit—zu erleben und zu gestalten',² and the second to Romanticism for, Strich continues: 'Das romantische Ideal aber muss unendlich ideal bleiben, und alle Romantik ist nur Weg und Bahn.'³

The idea is not new. Goethe defines the chief characteristic of Classicism as: 'der Charakter...des Menschlich-Vollendeten'⁴ and elsewhere he says: 'Er kommt der Antike nahe...so dass man sagen kann: er steht auf dem höchsten Punkt der Vollendung.'⁵ Goethe prefers the terms 'plastisch und romantisch' to 'klassisch und romantisch', but his conception of the difference is akin to that of Strich. Classicism represents to him a defined and completed form, 'ganz bestimmt und abgeschlossen', and Romanticism something indefinite, infinite.⁶ He says that he himself and Schiller, in his *Ueber naive und sentimentalische Dichtung*, were the inceptors of the idea of defining Romantic as opposed

¹ Strich, *Deutsche Klassik und Romantik*, p. 5, München, 1928.

² *Ib.* p. 7.

³ *Ib.* p. 10.

⁴ Bode, *Goethes Gedanken*, II, 196, Berlin, 1907.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 92.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 75.

to Classical poetry and that the brothers Schlegel developed and extended the idea.

Der Begriff von klassischer und romantischer Poesie, der jetzt über die ganze Welt geht und so viel Streit und Spaltungen verursacht, ist ursprünglich von mir und Schiller ausgegangen. . . Die Schlegel ergriffen die Idee und trieben sie weiter, so dass sie sich denn jetzt über die ganze Welt ausgedehnt hat und nun jedermann von Klassizismus und Romantizismus redet, woran vor fünfzig Jahren niemand dachte.¹

In *Ueber naive und sentimentalische Dichtung* Schiller says that the perfection of the classical age was the perfection of Nature, of absolute attainment, finite, complete. The aim of the modern poet, however, is worthy of greater praise for it is a higher ideal, an ideal always beyond attainment, so that it becomes infinite: 'Der eine erhält also seinen Werth durch absolute Erreichung einer endlichen, der andere erlangt ihn durch Annäherung zu einer unendlichen Grösse.'² In his praise of the idyll as that type of poetry which best reproduces the imagined state of innocence and harmony of the ancient Greeks, Schiller says that the chief characteristic of the idyll is that of 'Ruhe', the peace of completion, of perfect balance and fullness—'eine Ruhe der Vollendung'.³

Friedrich Schlegel's arguments are very similar to those of Schiller but much fuller, so that we are inclined to accept the opinion of Dilthey rather than that of Goethe on the question as to who was chiefly responsible for the widespread theories concerning Classicism and Romanticism. Dilthey says that however imperfect and immature Schlegel's attempt may have been, his historical method of approach proved more fruitful than the philosophical conception of Schiller. Of Friedrich Schlegel Dilthey says: 'Der Anfang der folgenreichen Unterscheidung klassischer und romantischer Dichtung lag in ihm.'⁴

Friedrich Schlegel discusses the theories of Schiller and says that not every striving for the infinite is 'sentimental' or romantic, nor is all classical poetry 'unbedingt vollkommen'. The expression of the infinite is found also in Aeschylus and Aristophanes⁵ but, he says, that which was common to all classical poetry is lacking in Romantic poetry, namely, 'Uebereinstimmung und Vollendung' and hence 'Ruhe'—Schiller's 'Ruhe der Vollendung'.⁶ Modern poetry, he says, cannot enjoy the calm contemplation of perfect beauty but is the expression of unsatisfied longing, 'Sehnsucht', for a beauty the perfection of which it can only vaguely surmise.⁷ The exalted destiny of the new poetry is nothing less

¹ Bode, *Goethes Gedanken*, II, 77, Berlin, 1907.

² *Schillers sämtliche Werke*, XII, 199, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1838.

³ *Ib.* XII, 243.

⁴ Dilthey, *Leben Schleiermachers*, I, 257, Berlin u. Leipzig, 1922.

⁵ *Friedrich Schlegels sämtliche Werke*, V, 17, Wien, 1823.

⁶ *Ib.* p. 26.

⁷ *Ib.* p. 28.

than the highest possible aim. This 'absolute', the highest point of perfection, can, however, never be attained: 'Das äusserste, was die strebende Kraft vermag, ist: sich diesem unerreichbaren Ziele immer mehr und mehr zu nähern.'¹ Perfection, Schlegel says, is the state when the inner, ever-striving power has developed to its utmost capacity. This was the state of poetry in the golden age of Greece. He describes it as 'vollständig und selbstgenugsam'.²

We are reminded of Herder's praise of Greece and his conception of evolution as an ever-recurring cycle when Schlegel describes Greek culture and poetry as

...ein in sich vollendetes Ganzes, welches durch blosser innre Entwicklung einen höchsten Gipfel erreichte, und in einem volligen Kreislauf, auch wieder in sich selbst zurücksank. Eben so selbstständig und in sich abgeschlossen und vollendet war auch die griechische Dichtkunst.³

Again he refers to it as 'ein selbstständiges, in sich vollendetes, vollkommnes Ganzes' and in comparison he defines Romantic poetry as 'ein unvollendeter Anfang'.⁴ The new poetry, he says, is to encompass all that has gone before. Classical poetry was 'ein einziges, untheilbares, vollendetes Gedicht', but this is to be 'das unendliche Gedicht'.⁵ Friedrich Schlegel's clearest and most valuable definition of Romantic poetry is, perhaps, that of the *Athenaeum* Fragment of 1798:

Die romantische Poesie ist eine progressive Universalpoesie....Die romantische Dichtart ist noch im Werden; ja das ist ihr eigentliches Wesen, dass sie ewig nur werden, nie vollendet seyn kann....Sie allein ist unendlich....⁶

August Wilhelm Schlegel also shared the interest in this problem of the time. Like Goethe he prefers the term 'plastisch'. He, too, refers to the culture of the Greeks as a natural education of perfection, completion, a 'vollendete Naturerziehung', a harmony of all the powers possible in a finite state. Human nature, being self-sufficient to the Greeks, was conscious of no shortcoming and did not strive toward a perfection which it could not attain by virtue of its own strength. But the coming of Christianity and the age of chivalry led to new ideals. Contemplation of the infinite destroyed the finite. We find this idea in Schiller's *Götter Griechenlands*, in his *Die Vier Weltalter*, in the works of Hölderlin, Hegel, Heine and the following generations influenced by them. The ancient world was one of beauty, happiness, perfection. For a later age there remained only longing:

So ist es denn auch: die Poesie der Alten war die des Besitzes, die unsrige ist die der Sehnsucht....Jene hat ihre Aufgabe bis zur Vollendung gelöst; diese kann ihrem Streben ins unendliche hin nur durch Annäherung Genüge leisten.⁷

¹ Ib. p. 75.

² Ib. p. 77.

³ Ib. p. 136.

⁴ Ib. p. 140.

⁵ Ib. p. 262 f.

⁶ *Athenaeum*, pp. 28, 29, 30, Berlin 1798, Ersten Bandes, Zweytes Stückes.

⁷ *August Wilhelm von Schlegels sämtliche Werke*, pp. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, Leipzig, 1846.

We are accustomed to the many definitions of Romantic poetry and the interminable discussions on that subject by scholars of the present day, but it is not always realized that the writers of the age when the Romantic School in Germany first had its being worked equally hard to define its characteristics. August Wilhelm Schlegel was not alone in his use of the word 'Sehnsucht' to express the indefinable striving of the Romantic poets for the unattainable. Mnioch, in his poem *Hellenik und Romantik* in the *Musen-Almanach* for 1802, calls it 'Sehnsucht, heiliges Pfand von unserm unendlichen Daseyn',¹ and contrasts the perfection and harmony of the classical age with the striving and disharmony of his own. He follows the same arguments as Schiller and A. W. Schlegel and says that the longing for the lost perfection will be stilled by a new longing of the Romantics: A. W. Schlegel in a letter to Tieck calls it 'ein vortreffliches Gedicht', for in it Mnioch has expressed the theories of Schlegel himself and of so many of the Romantic School.²

It is difficult to trace the influence of one writer on another at a time when similar ideas were current throughout literary circles in Germany, but it was no doubt to A. W. Schlegel that Heine owed many of his theories. His early work *Die Romantik* follows closely the arguments of Schlegel and in his *Romantische Schule* he says: 'Die klassische Kunst hatte nur das Endliche darzustellen. . . . Die romantische Kunst hatte das Unendliche und lauter spiritualistische Beziehungen darzustellen oder vielmehr anzudeuten. . . .'³ In the same way Hebbel seems to have been influenced by Friedrich Schlegel for he refers to a remark by Friedrich Schlegel in connection with the new school of poetry and then states:

Die griechische Poesie befriedigt kein Weltbedürfnis mehr; sie dauert aber fort, weil sie in sich vollendet ist, weil sie in sich vollendet werden konnte. Die romantische Poesie schliesst die Vollendung aus.⁴

A. STANSFIELD.

CHELSEFORD.

¹ *Musen-Almanach*, p. 222, Tübingen, 1802.

² *Ludwig Tieck u. die Brüder Schlegel*, p. 76, Briefe, Hsgn. v. H. Ludeke, Frankfurt am Main, 1930

³ *Heinrich Heines sämtliche Werke*, VII, 14, Insel Verlag, Leipzig, 1912.

⁴ Hebbel, *Sämtliche Werke*, Historisch-kritische Ausgabe, 'Tagebücher', I, 244, Berlin, 1903.

REVIEWS

Bede; his Life, Times and Writings; Essays in commemoration of his death. Edited by A. HAMILTON THOMPSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. xvi+277 pp. 15s.

The custom of publishing a volume of essays as homage to a great scholar or to commemorate some event in the recent or remote past seems now to be established. It has added one more difficulty to the task of those who, desiring to be acquainted with the literature of their subject, must not only search through numberless periodicals but must now, in addition, familiarize themselves with the contents of many volumes of this kind, often bearing titles which give but little indication of their contents. Perhaps the complaint is somewhat gratuitous in this instance, for the contents of this book are adequately indicated by its title. Essays on all subjects relating to Bede are included: essays on his life, his times, the monasteries in which he served, his merits as a historian, a theologian and a hagiologist, the chief manuscripts of his works and his library. Yet it must always be difficult to make a collection of essays by different writers hang together. Each essay is complete in itself, treating its subject, not as part of the working out of one general idea, but for its own sake. The question of relevance becomes acute. Would a student interested in the history of monastic institutions turn naturally to a book entitled *Bede, his Life, Times and Writings* for a valuable account of 'Northumbrian Monasticism' in general?

In his introduction the Bishop of Durham expresses his desire to connect the 'services in the churches and the historical pageants in the parishes' on the occasion of the twelfth centenary of Bede's death 'with an authoritative estimate of Bede and his work by scholars of indisputable distinction, and so to provide something which would be permanently serviceable to students of the period, and constitute a contribution of real value to our historical literature'. The book is thus intended to be a comprehensive statement of existing knowledge on subjects relating to Bede's life and work. It is a synthesis; and as such its quality, as the Bishop of Durham justly claims, 'is sufficiently guaranteed by the names of the authors'. It is scholarly but without inspiration.

The dullness of the book as a whole may perhaps be due to the initial difficulty of deciding what is appropriate to a volume of this kind. A centenary, however, is surely a sentimental occasion. The editor has indeed made a dignified concession to sentiment by including an essay on the surviving portions of the buildings at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow which Bede must have known, but no pictures or plans are given with it. Architectural descriptions, without illustrations, are always a strain on the layman's imagination; and, since this is an occasion for sentiment, it would have been pleasing to have been given more

pictures and a collection of essays which were less formal and more imaginative.

J. H. LE PATOUREL.

LONDON.

Byrhtnoth and Maldon. By E. D. LABORDE. London: Heinemann. 1936. vi+166 pp. 15s.

Dr Laborde has already done valuable work on the Battle of Maldon, and his article on the site of the battle has been accepted as conclusive. He now gives us a comprehensive edition of the Old English poem with a useful introduction on the historical background. In this introduction the editor has gathered together all the available information on the various persons mentioned in the poem, and he deals competently and convincingly with the problems connected with the battle. There is, however, no reason for believing in the sons whom he rather doubtfully attributes to Byrhtnoth. The writer of the *Liber Ehensis* tells how Leoflæd, the daughter of Byrhtnoth, was buried 'in cimiterio fratrum', which Dr Laborde translates as 'in the grave of her brothers'. But the obvious meaning of the phrase in its context is that Leoflæd, as a benefactor to the community, was buried in the monastic cemetery. Moreover Byrhtnoth's assumed overlordship of Northumbria depends simply on the presence of the Northumbrian hostage at the battle, and this is hardly enough to set against the negative evidence of all other authorities.

But whilst the historical part of the edition is, on the whole, comprehensive and competent the linguistic part, unfortunately, contains much to which exception can be taken. The following are a few of the more important points:

P. 75. The statement that 'From the beginning of the 13th century there was a tendency to substitute *æ* for *e*, especially in atonic syllables', is presumably due to a misprint.

P. 76. *-ræste* is not necessarily an example of this tendency since *æ* forms of the word are found in Alfredian texts. *þe*, *nelle*, *embe* are probably gradation variants of the usual forms and not due to O.E. *y* becoming *e*. *hīcgan*, *hīge*, *þinceð*, *drihten* are not from earlier forms in *ie*.

P. 77. Dr Laborde has not realized that initial *hl-*, *hr-*, etc., represent single voiceless consonants; cf. p. 87 where *hl-* is referred to as a consonant group.

In the section on metre an unwise attempt is made to indicate elided and syncopated vowels. But in most cases it is impossible to tell from the metre whether the vowel is to be pronounced or not. Nor will Dr Laborde's scansion of some of the individual lines meet with unqualified approval; cf. p. 59 and also note to line 152 where he has not realized that O.E. *x* is a graph for *hs* (as in this case) and *ks*. The principles on which the text has been edited are worthy of admiration and imitation. The glossary, too, is quite adequate though some of the modern forms given as descendants of the Old English are incorrect. In the notes the following points may be indicated:

L. 26. O.E. *wych* is an impossible form and the editors of the E.P.N.S. expressly reject Dr Laborde's interpretation; see E.P.N.S. i, ii, s.v. *wic*.

L. 71. 'might achieve slaughter' is an improbable translation of *fyl genāme*. Translate 'might receive death', i.e. be killed.

L. 98. O.E. *blāc* could not give the modern English 'bleak'. There are a certain number of misprints which need correction, for example, *geān* for *gean*, p. 10; *Klipstock* for *Klipstein*, p. 64; *spēdian* for *spēdan*, p. 73.

The poem owes so much to Dr Laborde's work on the historical background that it is disappointing to find his edition so weak on the linguistic side.

R. M. WILSON.

LEEDS.

The Exeter Book. Edited by GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP and ELLIOTT VAN KIRK DOBBIE. New York: Columbia University Press; London: George Routledge and Sons. 1936. cxvii+382 pp. 18s.

In the preface Mr Dobbie states that the late Professor Krapp had prepared the text and notes of about one half of the contents of the *Exeter Book* at the time of his death in 1934, and had written drafts of the discussions of *Christ*, *Guthlac* and *Azarias*. Thus considerably more than one half of the work on this edition is due to Mr Dobbie. The Introduction contains sections on the MS. and brief discussions of each of the poems contained in the book. Thanks to the fine facsimile edition published in 1933 by the labours of Förster, Chambers and Flower it has been unnecessary to examine the MS. for the edition under present notice. The Bibliography, while adequate as a record of published texts, complete and partial, of the *Exeter Book*, as well as of translations and articles in periodicals, deliberately omits works of a general literary interest. In fact, this edition is a manual intended primarily we should say for advanced university students of Old English, a purpose which, like its predecessors in the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* series, it fulfils most creditably. The functions of the editors are limited to weighing up the arguments of scholars who have discussed the many obscurities in the text and its interpretation, and giving their own judgement in many cases, usually a cautious and sound one. The result is a very compact and useful aid even for advanced students, who have hitherto lacked a competent guide to the commentary on these texts in their entirety.

The treatment of the text is strictly conservative, only the most obvious errors in the MS. being emended, while every departure from the MS. is recorded in the footnotes. Proposed emendations by other scholars are tersely stated and discussed in the Notes. What we may call the practical and non-literary nature of this edition is well seen in the four pages of the Introduction devoted to *Christ*, where the only matter treated of is the question of the unity of the poem.

We have noted very few errors and no misprints. It is to be observed that the Notes are more copious in the case of some poems than of others: e.g. the *Riddles* are very fully annotated, whereas for *Widsith*, a very

important poem, hardly more than two pages of notes are considered sufficient. We have no space for detailed criticisms or suggestions, but we might note that in *Widsith*, l. 103, the proper name *Scilling* is doubtless that of the scop's harp (see *M.L.R.*, xxvi, 75); the runes in the *Husband's Message*, ll. 49, 50, are, as once suggested by the present reviewer, an anagram, *gecyre* being for *gecyrr* 'turn about', 're-arrange', and lastly, *Wolf and Eadwacer* may well be a monologue by a female dog who has had a 'past' with a wolf and is calling on her respectable, sleeping kennel-mate Eadwacer, the 'guardian of property', to rescue their puppy from a wolfish kidnapper (see *M.L.R.*, xxvi, 74-5). The above suggestions have not been noted by Messrs Krapp and Dobbie. Their edition is to be heartily welcomed, coming as it does so soon after the publication of the facsimile. Old English scholars now have what they have long desired.

W. J. SEDGEFIELD.

LONDON.

The Seege of Troye. By G. HOFSTRAND. (*Lund Studies in English*. IV.)
Lund: Gleerup; London: William and Norgate. 1936. 205 pp.

This is a thorough review and continuation in detail of Miss Barnicle's preliminary investigation into the intertextual relations of the *Seege or Batayle of Troye* with which she prefaced her edition of the manuscripts, the four together for the first time, for the Early English Text Society (O.S. 172) in 1927. The textual variants are set out and considered individually, line by line, throughout the poem, and so arranged as to bring out first the group relationships of the manuscripts, then their individual difficulties and distinctions, from which emerges a table of descent. Although a more prominent difference between the particular and general conclusions might make reference to the book easier, the method is clear and good and enables the reader to accompany the author critically step by step towards the summarized results at the close of each section. These conclusions are nicely drawn, with scholarly unwillingness to allow the material to be a jot more significant than it is. The warning expressed on p. 13 and stressed on p. 49, against assuming metrical regularity, might perhaps have appeared with advantage earlier (e.g. to lines 71 and 80); but on the whole the judicious mixture of certitude and tentativeness, the lucid statement, the awareness equally to the needs of language, metre, rhyme, sense and fine differences of expression would make this study an admirable introduction to the business of textual criticism.

The author agrees in general with Miss Barnicle but criticizes certain of her details and finds the intertextual relations far less simple and immediate than she had proposed. He also suggests E.M.L. rather than N.W.M.L. as the dialect of the original poem, but he does not follow up the interesting and frequent resemblances between this poem and the considerably earlier *Havelock*. He shows, however, in the note on sources and the chapter on parallel passages, that it is a true tributary of the stream of popular romance.

The study throws much light on the circulation of romance, its *tellers'* different methods of treatment, the interesting element of individual characteristics in transmission, the effect of minstrel and clerkly handling, of oral or closet redaction; and on that perilous fate whereby, for instance, a Juno, Minerva and Venus are brought to discover themselves as four elfin ladies, Saturnus, Jubiter, Mercurius and Venus—whose greater fame in this case served her well!

H. A. C. GREEN.

LONDON.

The Early English Carols. Edited by RICHARD LEIGHTON GREENE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1935. cxlv+461 pp. 30s.

Precision of nomenclature is of obvious value in literary studies, and in mediæval and Renaissance work often difficult to cultivate because of the apparent indifference of these periods to it. Understanding of what constitutes a particular genre of poetry will frequently enlighten us about the attitude of the writer both to his subject and to the form in which it is cast. There is therefore good reason to welcome a comprehensive study of the carol, one of the most significant lyric forms of the Middle Ages. Dr Greene has performed his task with scholarship and insight, and this is likely to remain a standard work. One has always known vaguely that the carol had some relation to the dance; but that alone does not distinguish it from a number of other lyric forms that also sprang from the dance—the ballade and the rondeau, for example. This book establishes the peculiar features of the carol, its distinctness from related forms and the influences which shaped it from folk material into a purely literary species.

Dance, music and poetry are a persistent triangle in early European art, and little has so far been done in England towards tracing their interaction. The enquiry will necessarily involve reference to popular traditions, with which courtly writers were always in close contact because of the primitive social structure of England. Chambers's *Mediaeval Stage* and Baskervill's book on the jig are symptomatic of an increasing realization of the value of such study, and Cecil Sharp showed how the three arts must be considered together to view folk culture in true perspective. If Dr Greene's book has any fault it is that its point of view is too exclusively literary; but he is far from being blind to the other aspects of his subject. He gives many valuable facts about the dance figures that determined the form of the carol and about the popular ritual and beliefs preserved in the extant texts.

Up to the end of the fifteenth century 'carol' always meant a poem sung to the accompaniment of dancing. A dance without vocal accompaniment was never so named, though the steps and figures might be the same as those of a carol. Nor could 'carol' originally apply to a song without its appropriate dance. When the strict use declined and a carol came to be merely a song the original meaning persisted to the extent that it was always form rather than content that differentiated it. There are both sacred and secular, serious and farcical examples in the present

collection, but all are comprehended under Dr Greene's definition of a carol as 'a song on any subject, composed of uniform stanzas and provided with a burden' (p. xxxii).

The majority of early European dances are of the round type. In the carol

... the movement was ordinarily three steps in measure to the left, followed by some kind of marking time in place. It was usual for the dancers to join hands, but gestures seem frequently to have been introduced which would require the clasp to be broken (p. xxxi).

A leader sang the stanzas during the movement, and the chorus replied with a refrain while marking time. The original form was probably a couplet by the soloist followed by the refrain, but by the twelfth century the soloist's part had grown to three lines, yielding a form *aaa R* or *aaa RR*. The soloist would finish with a word acting as cue for the chorus. Sometimes a change of rime sufficed as cue; hence the common English rime scheme *aaar RR*. Though most of the other forms derived from the dance gradually absorbed the refrain into an elaborate stanza pattern, the carol always maintained the separate entity of the refrain, which opened the composition and followed every stanza.

The importance of all these literary sophistications of folk dance, the ballade, the rondeau and the carol, lies in the extra-literary influences that determined poetic form up to the sixteenth century. A study of the musical styles to which these carol texts were united would extend the inferences to be drawn from them. The stylization of dance songs into artificial lyrics was no doubt assisted by the development of polyphonic texture in music. The dance figures, however, remained the only basis of musical form. It is clear that the repetitions in a form like the rondeau serve no literary purpose, but they allow the music to concentrate interest on two themes. The survival of the carol in the early sixteenth century probably had a similar cause. Composers usually set the stanzas to different music, preserving one theme for the refrain throughout; so that a form exactly like that of the classical rondo resulted (apart from modulation to new keys). As the stylization became more complete and the dance origin forgotten, the musical form followed that of the verse rather than that of the dance figure, while speech patterns of greater complication were devised by the individual poet. Music, instead of determining the form of the verse, was thrown back on song form based on the text, and it was not until the seventeenth century that it returned to the dance to find a principle of form separate from that of poetry. The fact that lyrics were to be sung, however, continued to affect both content and structure long after the primitive dance figures had been overlaid by elaborate rime schemes.

These delicate adjustments between poetry and music must be carefully weighed before any true estimate of the mediæval lyric can be attained. It is to be hoped that someone with an adequate knowledge of both literature and music will follow up the start made by Dr Greene. He has suggested that the kind of technique suitable to more modern poetry is inappropriate in dealing with material that is not so much

literary as a fusion of poetry, music and dance, and that depends on a culture more primitive but more homogeneous than ours.

BRUCE PATTISON.

LONDON.

King John. Edited by J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1936. lxxxii+208 pp. 6s.

Professor Dover Wilson's edition of *King John* follows the pattern of the other volumes in the New Cambridge Shakespeare. In the introduction, which is longer than usual, he is concerned mainly with two points; it is 'an indisputable example of textual revision and the only one in which the source play has come down to us', and 'the only occasion on which Shakespeare deals directly with the main issue of his age, viz. the religious question and the conflict between the English Monarchy and the Papacy'.

After a section on *King John* in History, he compares Shakespeare's play with the *Troublesome Reign* to show that *King John* is the later, and that any theory which would make the *Troublesome Reign* a pirated version of *King John* is untenable. He notes various inconsistencies in *King John* which can only be explained by reference to the older play, and finds in certain peculiarities of the Folio text evidence of a second revision by Shakespeare of his own play.

As for the date 'the play itself is rich in contemporary allusions, and these, it is striking to notice, all point to the early nineties'. On examination these allusions turn out to be a phrase paralleled in the *Spanish Tragedy* (which he even thinks Kyd may have borrowed from Shakespeare), 'an illusion [inspired misprint!] to the scattering of the Spanish Armada in 1588', whilst the speech on Commodity he regards as reflecting on the conversion of Henri IV in 1593. The conclusion is that *King John* was first written in 1590 and revised in 1594.

This conclusion ignores certain pertinent factors. The contemporary allusions do not point necessarily to the date 1590-4 at all. Some years ago I collected and printed in the *Times Literary Supplement* a number of passages from *King John* which were particularly relevant to the summer of 1596.¹ Professor Dover Wilson seems not to have noticed this article. If I was right, then his case for 1590-4 collapses; and if wrong, no reliance can be placed in contemporary allusions either way! There are also serious critical objections to the date 1590-4. Though the bad passages in *King John* (and there are many) are as bad as any of Shakespeare's immature writing, the best passages are more mature, more flexible in their rhythms, than anything that Shakespeare is known to have written by 1594; the admirable opening to the play, for instance, or the soliloquies of the Bastard on 'new made honour' or 'commodity'.

As for Professor Dover Wilson's text; it is his own. When first he began to publish the New Cambridge Shakespeare he was so eager a convert to the 'exquisite pointing' of the Folio that he invented a special punctua-

¹ *Times Literary Supplement*, 13 November 1930. Reprinted in *Shakespeare Criticism* 1919-1935, ed. World's Classics.

tion, with ... and even ... to assist the modern reader to appreciate its subtleties. There were fifty-one of these hybrids in the first ten pages of *The Tempest*: in *King John* there are only twelve, for Professor Dover Wilson has lost his faith. He now treats the Folio pointing so lightly that it would be better to abolish this special punctuation altogether. Thus, to take a random instance, the Folio reads:

Drawne in the flattering table of her eie,
Hang'd in the frowning wrinkle of her brow,
And quarter'd in her heart, he doth espie
Himselfe loues traytor, this is pittie now;
That hang'd, and drawne, and quarter'd there should be
In such a loue, so vile a Lout as he.

The subtlety of this pointing is entirely lost in Professor Dover Wilson's new text:

Drawn in the flattering table of her eye!
Hanged in the frowning wrinkle of her brow!
And quartered in her heart! he doth espy
Himself love's traitor. This is pity now,
That, hanged and drawn and quartered, there should be,
In such a love so vile a lout as he.

As for the Folio text, the inference is 'that the copy used by the compositors for *King John* in 1623 was either a good playhouse prompt-book or a careful transcript therefrom', which is afterwards elaborated to afford evidence that Shakespeare's first revision was written for one company, and his second for the Chamberlain's Men. It may be so; yet one cannot but share the growing scepticism in the validity of 'scientific bibliography', partly because the conclusions inevitably rest upon essential factors no longer ascertainable, partly because far more general reconnaissance of all the problems—the practices of authors, playhouses, copyists, proof-readers and individual printing houses—is needed before the problems of a particular play can be attacked. Meanwhile the New Cambridge Shakespeare is as stimulating as ever, not least when it stimulates to disagreement.

G. B. HARRISON.

LONDON.

Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries. By M. CHANNING LINTHICUM. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1936. viii + 307 pp., 20 illustrations. 15s.

In this book Miss Linthicum's purpose is to give

(1) a brief survey of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century colours, their production, symbolism, and periods of fashion; (2) a similar discussion of costume textiles and garments; (3) the earliest known date of the use in England of each colour, textile, garment, accessory, trimming, fastener, mentioned in the plays of dramatists who were writing during the age of Shakespeare; (4) a definition, with illustrative quotation from drama and contemporary accounts... of each of these colours, textiles, garments.

The book is thus not a history of costume as a whole, but is concerned with the exact definition of particular garments. These definitions are full and clear, and provide just that information which is necessary to

understand the many detailed references to costume in contemporary drama. The notes, for instance, on such matters as chopines, doublets, hose, hangers, are not only adequate, but illustrated by good photographs of the articles themselves.

In the chapter on colour symbolism perhaps too much is claimed. It is doubtful whether the normal spectator would have seen any particular significance in most stage costumes unless colour was exaggerated or commented upon in the dialogue, especially since the various colours often carry a wide range of symbolism. Yellow, for example, which includes all shades from lemon to orange-tawny, can denote love, jealousy and pride. Malvolio's yellow stockings, says Miss Linthicum, 'of course indicate love'. It is more likely that they symbolize pride; but they need not necessarily symbolize anything more than that when a grave and reverend steward suddenly assumes the gay colours of a fashionable gallant he is, and looks, a fool.

The best test, however, of such a book is to try it out on some typical passages such as 'Here is an English tailor come hither for stealing out of a French hose'; 'you rode like a kern of Ireland, your French hose on and in your straight strossers'; or the lady's cap which Petruchio so disliked. On caps Miss Linthicum is enlightening; 'strossers' are not to be found in the index (which indeed is hardly adequate), but under 'Trousers' the passage is quoted, though Miss Linthicum does not give the explanation that 'straight strossers' meant 'bare legs'—as in the well-known portrait of Captain Thomas Lee. 'French hose' is apparently not explained for the *Macbeth* context.

Miss Linthicum has consulted many and varied sources of information; she would have found some additional information in one or two of the language-books, such as Minshew's *Dictionary in Spanish and English*. She dispels one or two old illusions; silk stockings were known long before Mistress Montague presented a pair to Queen Elizabeth in 1560; after all Hieronimo did wear a nightshirt; and apparently the Archduchess Isabella's ill-used underclothing was not responsible for the colour known as 'Isabelle', for it is mentioned eight years before the siege of Ostend; one would like to know the origin of the story, which, however, Miss Linthicum does not mention.

As a whole this is a most useful book for students of Elizabethan drama and literature, and deserves the label 'indispensable'. The twenty illustrations are well chosen and well reproduced.

G. B. HARRISON.

LONDON.

Mr Pepys Upon the State of Christ-Hospital. By RUDOLPH KIRK. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1935. viii + 65 pp. and appendices. 9s.

The general public are slow to understand that their Mr Pepys is not just the historical Mr Pepys, that the libertine Pepys had a McConachie who had an insatiable appetite for public business and who carried out

his business undertakings with a zeal and probity which were highly embarrassing to lax officials. Mr Kirk's book focuses attention on that Mr Pepys and enables us to see him as, what indeed he was, one of the public-spirited men whose lives have been built into the splendid fabric of London's charities and institutions. The attentive reader of the Diary had, no doubt, noted in its later parts recurrent references to the call of Christ-Hospital on Pepys's time, but now, thanks to Mr Kirk's industry, the story has been detached from the Diary and the matter pursued, long after the Diary had ceased, into the Revolution period when Pepys had time and to spare for such work.

The story is little short of heroic. Here we have a Pepys, no longer young and jolly, wrestling with the seven devils of corruption and sloth in a public foundation, triumphing in the end, but too infirm to apply the authority which was at last entrusted to him to root out the evil. It has its special interest to-day when writers on educational foundations have been turning public attention to the manner in which such foundations were filched from the poor and became the privilege of the comparatively well-to-do. One has only to read one of the documents which Mr Kirk reproduces here, *Mr Pepys Upon the Present State of Christ-Hospital*, to see how his heart burned in the cause of the poor orphan. It is to be feared that a melancholy or, according to temperament, cynical answer is all we can even at this time of day return to Mr Pepys's summing up: 'What is to be hop'd-for, either of Satisfaction for so much of our Poor's Stock and Benefactor's Bounties as has already miscarry'd; or of better Provision in time to come, for securing the Remainder?' The Church of England characteristically decried the reformer's efforts to clean out the stable.

This then is a useful little book for the recovering of Pepys's fame among the general (the instructed have always been aware of his heroic efforts as a public servant), but also as ammunition for the educational reformer in our day. It is so thoroughly documented that no cavil or doubt of the author's deductions and conclusions seems possible. In particular we think ourselves fortunate in having the facsimile text of Pepys's six papers *Upon the Present State of Christ-Hospital*.

It only remains to say that Mr Kirk writes pleasantly and that from his pages emerges clearly the Pepys who can with justice include himself among men 'whose Morals (like *mine*) know no Middle, in matters of *Trust* at least, being scrupulously Just, and down-right on the contrary'.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

John Arbuthnot: Mathematician and Satirist. By LESTER M. BEATTIE. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. xvi+432 pp. 15s.

It is now more than forty years since the late G. A. Aitken's *Life and Works of John Arbuthnot* appeared, and in the interval knowledge both of the man and of his period has grown considerably. Dr Beattie warns us,

however, that his approach is critical rather than biographical. To some extent this must silence the criticism that many readers will feel inclined to make of this new book on Arbuthnot. The author is undeniably well read in the literature of the early eighteenth century, he throws a great deal of light on the contemporary background of allegory and satire, he deals sensibly with such vexed questions as the authorship of the John Bull pamphlets. But he fails to explain—or, more precisely, he does not make his reader feel—the spell that Arbuthnot exercised upon the minds of such men as Swift, Pope, and Robert Harley. Arbuthnot remains almost as elusive as ever; and the portrait of him from the Scottish National Portrait Gallery which appears as the frontispiece to this book only serves to increase the reader's disappointment. It is the portrait of a remarkable man; and the subject of Dr Beattie's study is rather a person who got mixed up in various forgotten controversies, and who cannot be torn from his context without suffering mutilation in the process.

To such objections Dr Beattie may reply that it is impossible to deal in a scholarly manner with Arbuthnot unless one is prepared to explore the background. That is undoubtedly true; but he occasionally wanders so far into the controversial thickets that he loses sight of Arbuthnot for longer periods than is really necessary. His section on 'Dr Woodward and the Antiquarians' (pp. 209–223) is a useful summary of Woodward's career, and some prelude of this kind was necessary for a discussion of the Scriblerus papers and the other satires on this fiery antiquary, but it might have been given more briefly. The ultimate justification for such a work as this is that it clears the ground for a better view of some great work of art that time has partially obscured. But good as are some of Arbuthnot's satirical thrusts it is doubtful whether anything of his is quite great enough to justify such labours as Dr Beattie's here. He would have been happier, perhaps, editing the John Bull pamphlets, with the scholarly introduction which he has both the knowledge and the ability to write; or, better still, giving us the first complete account of the Scriblerus Club.

Some of his judgements on Arbuthnot's friends will not satisfy everyone. He has a tendency (cf. p. 285), when it is a question of deciding between Pope and Arbuthnot in the matter of joint authorship, to assign to Arbuthnot what is clever, and to Pope what is merely dull or spiteful. He finds, too (p. 388), a savagery in Swift that the context hardly justifies. It should be possible to emphasize Arbuthnot's wit and geniality without unnecessarily damaging the reputation of his friends. Dr Beattie would do well to reconsider a statement (p. 283) that many of the notes in the 1729 variorum of the *Dunciad* were signed 'Bentley'; and his ascription of *One Epistle* to James Moore Smythe is surely too confident. This attack on Pope—one of the most damaging made by any of the dunces—seems altogether too good to be the work of Moore Smythe; it was, in fact, attributed to Welsted by Savage, who asserted in his *Author to be Let* that Moore Smythe had acted only as 'Man-Midwife' for his friend. But it would be ungracious and unjust to overlook the very real merits of Dr Beattie's study. He is at his best in discussing the various sources from

which Arbuthnot may have taken hints for his John Bull pamphlets; and there his thorough investigation leaves nothing to be desired.

In conclusion, this seems to be the right place to call attention to a poem of 106 lines which may plausibly be ascribed to Arbuthnot. In a Dublin miscellany of 1721—*A Miscellaneous Collection of Poems, Songs, and Epigrams. By several Hands. Published by T. M. Gent.*—there is a poem (vol. I, pp. 185–9) called ‘A Tale: Shewing how the Moon was made of a Green Cheese’. It is a pleasant narrative poem with some strokes of good-humoured satire, and that sort of learned fantasy which one associates with the members of the Scriblerus Club. Was Arbuthnot the author? In a political ballad, *The Barber Turn’d Packer (Political Ballads Illustrating the Administration of Sir Robert Walpole.* Ed. Milton Percival, p. 30) Arbuthnot (‘the Doctor’) is mentioned along with Pulteney (‘the Squire’). Arbuthnot, it is said,

without Fees
His brain he doth squeeze,
To prove that the Moon it is made of green Cheese.
Those wholesome Prescriptions he writes not for Rhino,
But waits his Reward from *Jure Divino*.

The reference to the moon and green cheese may, of course, have a purely proverbial significance, i.e. Arbuthnot is squeezing his brain to prove the impossible. But it would be interesting to have the opinion of Dr Beattie, who could say whether on internal evidence the poem in question is likely to be the work of Arbuthnot.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

Aspects of Eighteenth Century Nature Poetry. By C. V. DEANE. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1935. 145 pp. 7s. 6d.

Mr Deane’s sympathetic and discriminating study is an interesting example of the contemporary revaluation of eighteenth-century poetry. Twenty years ago critical opinion was still content to accept Wordsworth’s low estimate of the nature poetry of the century. It was generally assumed, too, that the poetic diction of the eighteenth century was a deplorable mistake, and that for more than a hundred years it had fallen like a veil between the poet and his object, muffling his powers of expression, and deadening his very perception. This was the opinion of Coleridge, and of the late Professor Housman; indeed, it is still the orthodox point of view. But in recent years there has been a tendency to examine the diction of eighteenth-century poetry with a more friendly—if not less critical—eye, and a new willingness to recognize that such poets as Pope and Thomson knew what they wanted to do, even if that happens to be something that most modern readers do not want to have done.

Mr Deane clears the ground for his discussion by examining first of all personification and abstraction, stock imagery, poetic periphrasis, and the theories of generalized form and diction which flourished in the eighteenth century. On each of those points he is able to show that there was a good as well as a bad side to contemporary poetic practice; and

by a sensitive analysis of different passages he brings out clearly the kind of effects that the eighteenth-century poet was aiming at. Two useful chapters follow on 'Pictorial Description and Landscape Art' and on 'Principles of Visual Composition in Eighteenth-Century Nature Poetry'—useful because Mr Deane is a competent reader of poetry, and because he approaches his subject with an adequate knowledge of eighteenth-century painting. His analysis of the 'prospect Poem'—particularly of the Hagley Park passage in Thomson's *Spring*—is perhaps the most valuable section in the book. In the end he tests and amplifies his conclusions by a separate study of four nature poets: Pope, Ambrose Philips, John Philips, and Shenstone. Occasionally Mr Deane's sensitiveness prompts him to detect resemblances where they can hardly be said to exist. After mentioning Cowper's characterization of sparrows as 'the pert voracious kind', he goes on to add: 'a phrase which in its happy intimacy calls to mind Keats's "if a sparrow comes before my window I take part in its existence and pick about the gravel".' Without being unduly Johnsonese, one may reasonably object to this that the only link between the two passages seems to be the word 'sparrow'. But Mr Deane does not often invite such comments. His work is mature and scholarly, and in many places it should prove a valuable corrective to text-book ideas of the eighteenth century.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

Thomas De Quincey. A Biography. By HORACE AINSWORTH EATON. London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. xii+542 pp. 24s.

It may at once be said that the author of this work has succeeded in his task, that of presenting a detailed narrative of De Quincey's life, which throws fresh light on the career of that interesting but elusive personality. Among earlier biographies those of Page, Masson, and Leslie Stephen are perhaps the best known. What Professor Eaton has here attempted is to fill in gaps, to correct impressions in the light of further evidence, and in general to bring out the significance of all the documents now available. The work is thus the result of considerable research, ranging over unpublished papers in the possession of the De Quincey family, a mass of private and business correspondence, besides court records and reports of conversations hitherto inaccessible. And at the same time advantage has been taken of the autobiographical material scattered here and there in De Quincey's own pages. The outcome of it all is a fascinating, well-documented story which carries the reader through the many vicissitudes of De Quincey's life—his experiences in London, Grasmere, Edinburgh, Lasswade, and elsewhere, his interesting associations with contemporary men of letters, his literary ventures, his financial troubles, and finally the publication of his *Collected Works* (1850-9). The main outline of the story, it is true, remains much as before: no new activities are unearthed, no startling revelations are made. But by a judicious and skilful use of his abundant material Professor Eaton has created a fresh portrait of De Quincey the man, in all the fulness of his day-to-day activities, with a

completeness of detail hitherto unequalled. And not least valuable in his treatment is the summing-up of his impressions in the Epilogue, with its admirable character-sketch of De Quincey himself.

At the same time something is missing from the picture as it stands; and this is due to the self-imposed limits of the writer, his concentration for the most part on external facts, rather than on the inner experiences of his subject. The all-important matters in the life of a man of letters are, however, his intellectual interests, his outlook on life and literature. And a life-story which passes somewhat lightly over De Quincey's literary work, his views on philosophy, history, religion, and the like, omits something that is vital and essential to the full understanding of the man. More especially is this true of Professor Eaton's treatment of De Quincey as a literary critic, which is limited practically to a brief three-page summary of his work in this particular field. Yet as a means of affording insight into De Quincey's mentality no chapter would have been more illuminating than one dealing with his views on literary theory, together with his uncertain yet suggestive judgements. In Professor Eaton's appreciations, all too brief, of these and other literary activities, there is much that is of positive value; sufficient to cause us to regret the severe economy he has exercised in this respect, while also encouraging the hope that he will yet complete his work in a more extended treatment of De Quincey's mind and art.

In the meantime we welcome most heartily what he has already given us—a scholarly and reliable account of the known facts of De Quincey's life, written in fresh and cultured style. The work, it might be added, lacks nothing in its presentment. There is a typographical error on p. 100, and the unfamiliar form 'Westmorland' is preferred throughout. But apart from such details it forms a most attractive volume; and what is more, it may safely be commended as a valuable addition to our works on literary history.

J. W. H. ATKINS.

ABERYSTWYTH.

The Development of Modern English. By STUART ROBERTSON. London: Harrap. 1936. ix+559 pp. 10s. 6d.

This book presents the reader with more than it promises. It purports to be an account of the development of *modern English*; in fact it is a general sketch of the history of the language from its beginnings—and even before—to the present day. Its twelve successive chapters, however much they aim at running on independent lines, fall into the four traditional groups: I–V, origins and accident; VI–VIII, phonology with special reference to pronunciation and spelling reform; IX–XI, vocabulary and semantics; XII, unsystematic remarks on some points of syntax.

The scope of the volume is therefore of the widest. It ranges from the earliest efforts at 'human speech', through Indo-European, Teutonic, Old and Middle English, to the latest innovations in 'American' sound and phrase. It is perhaps inevitable that such extension should lead occasionally to some laxness of grasp. The reader feels now and then that

the book presupposes in him a knowledge that it would be its business to impart. If there are mentioned, for instance (on p. 111), the two kinds of Anglo-Saxon declensions, the vocalic and the consonantal, together with the most usual endings, the reason is not given for that distinction, though it is essential to the study even of present-day English accidence. In the same way, it is not sufficient to say, as on p. 141, that 'the strong verbs in O.E. fall into six classes, according to their ablaut series': a statement of the principle of gradation in Indo-European, and of its variations in Germanic and in Anglo-Saxon, should precede and explain the verbal forms referred to. Even the instances quoted on p. 365 (*ring, rang, rung* or *drive, drove, driven*) fail to enlighten the student for want of a more systematic tabulation. The account of the great vowel-shift of modern English is, partly at least, singularly vague and even misleading. It is perfectly true that 'throughout the M.E. period', both open \bar{e} (ags. \bar{e} and \bar{ea}) and close \bar{e} (ags. \bar{e} , \bar{eo} , \bar{ie}) 'were designated indifferently by *e* or *ee*'. But it is surely inaccurate to add 'that the two sounds were distinct until well within the modern period', and that 'the subsequent development, beginning, it is supposed, in the XVIIIth century, was a raising to [i:] of all the varieties of *e* that have been mentioned' (p. 204). For it cannot be doubted that \bar{e} was already transcribed *i* by Wycliff c. 1380, and that this spelling became current in the next century, at a time when even \bar{e} , slowly following suit, began to be transformed into *i* or *y* in such words as to *styll* (=to steal), *shype* (sheep), to *appyr* (1419-1465).

A few minor corrections might perhaps be suggested here: such a form as **gōsiz* surely is not Teutonic (p. 104), as is shown by the survival of modern German *Gans*: it is rather Anglo-Frisian or Primitive Anglo-Saxon; the vowel in *night* (ags. *niht*, Germanic *naht*) is umlaut indeed, but singular (**neakti-*) as well as plural (p. 117); Milton's *shoon* (p. 118) is not 'a belated occurrence of a weak plural', but a M.E. analogical weak form, since the ags. pl. was *scōs* or *scēos*; that the weak preterite *dived* has replaced *dove* (p. 141) seems doubtful in view of the fact that the *New Oxford Dictionary* quotes *dove* as being quite recent, dialectal or American; it should be noted, as against p. 135, that the adjectival suffix *lic* differs from the adverbial *lice* not only by its ending, but by its quantity; the nouns *cnīf* and *hæfene* (haven), if Scandinavian borrowings, differ from the other words listed on p. 329 by having been already incorporated into Anglo-Saxon, and it is claiming too great a success for the *Ormulum* to say (p. 272) that it 'appeared soon after 1200', since it remained buried in the silence of its manuscript until R. M. White disinterred it in 1852.

What seems to us really original and most useful in this book is its American side. General studies of American English are indeed not rare, as appears from the short, but helpful, bibliographical 'references' annexed to each chapter. But it is seldom the case that a consideration of American speech should become an integral part of a study of the language, and in this respect the volume is particularly informative, to us at least. According to Mr Robertson (p. 80), 'American is far more uniform than British': it has no dialects, and its clearest lines of cleavage

occur in the pronunciation. It would seem that 'the convention of dividing American pronunciation into three great zones or areas is now well established' (p. 220): the 'English of New England' in which special resemblances to the speech of Southern England can be traced; the 'Southern American type' connected with the former by a common colonial and Puritan origin, and last, but most important of all by its continuous spread, what is termed 'the General American brand' (p. 216), reminiscent of the speech of Northern, rather than of Southern, England. It is characterized by greater monotony 'of pitch and rhythm' than is usual in English, by a sort of 'droning' or drawl, which brings into perceptible relief the secondary stresses of such suffixes as *-ary*, *-ery*, *-ory* (p. 224), and is often associated, especially in the rural districts, with a strong nasal twang. Instead of semi-vocalizing the *r* as in Standard English and in New England speech, it has kept the real consonant in the production of which 'the tongue-point lightly touches the upper gums' (p. 178); it has in common with Northern English the short *æ* pronunciation of the *a* in *ask*, *bask*, *half*, *dance*, *pass*; it simplifies into *u* the *ju* diphthong in *duke*, *duty*, *new*, *student*, *tube*; it develops an *a* or an [ɔ:] sound in the pronunciation of *o* in such words as: *hot*, *not*, *rock*, *possible* on the one hand, and in *coffee*, *soft*, *-gone*, *long*, *-mock*, *God*, *bog*, etc., on the other (p. 238-9). The circumstances incident on a settler's life in strange and vast regions have brought about numerous variations of meaning in words already familiar, and the creation of neologisms, all described as 'Americanisms' (p. 473-4). Even in syntax, some changes can be noted, among others the preference given to *will* over *shall* in the formation of the future tense (p. 518).

Enough has been said to show the interest that attaches to one at least of the aspects of this volume which, taken as a whole, strikes us as being a varied and instructive series of essays on the development of English, rather than a systematic study of the history of the language.

R. HUCHON.

PARIS.

Books known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670-804).

By J. D. A. OGILVY. (*Studies and Documents*, No. 2. The Mediæval Academy of America.) Cambridge, Mass. 1936. xvi+109 pp. \$2.25.

This is a brave attempt at a very difficult task, and in publishing his doctoral thesis more or less as it originally stood, Mr Ogilvy has probably made a wise decision. He is conscious that it is capable of considerable improvement (he estimates, with a clear knowledge of what is involved, that the labour of another twenty-five years might well be needed), but he decided that its immediate value to scholars must outweigh other considerations. It would, therefore, be ungracious to blame Mr Ogilvy for limitations of which he is obviously aware, and churlish not to congratulate him on having made accessible in a well-arranged form a great deal of very useful information. Considerations of space, no doubt, made

it impossible to avoid the rather meagre treatment of such subjects as the 'growth of English Libraries', the 'provenance and form of English Books', and 'Education before Hadrian and Theodore'.

It is disappointing to find such a short and insufficient bibliography, and reference is by no means always made to the best editions of the authors whose works are under discussion. Thus it is surprising to see Ambrose's hymns quoted from Migne, and, for Augustine, to observe a complete neglect of the edition in the *Vienna Corpus*. On the question of the genuine hymns of Ambrose, Mr Ogilvy is content to throw up the sponge, without placing any trust in the efforts of recent critics.

It is, indeed, in its fairly frequent neglect of recent literature that Mr Ogilvy's book is weakest. He does not, I think, refer to Professor Laistner's remarkable paper on 'Bede as a Classical and Patristic Scholar', *Trs. of Royal Hist. Soc.*, 1933, pp. 69 sqq., which would have been very helpful, and might have induced him to revise his suggestion that Bede knew Horace and perhaps Terence, Livy and Juvenal. At any rate, he would have had an additional reason for caution in a path so full of pitfalls. Winterfeld's arguments that Horace was unknown to Alcuin (in 'Wie sah der Codex Blandinus vetustissimus des Horaz aus?', *Rheinisches Museum*, LX, 1905, pp. 31 sqq.) ought hardly to have been passed over in silence.

That Bede knew Vegetius cannot be doubted; this was shown by C. W. Jones, 'Bede and Vegetius', *Classical Review*, XLVI, 1932, pp. 248 sq., and it may be that this author's *Eptoma Rei Militaris*, which was well known in Carolingian times, passed from England to the Continent.

On p. 63, Mr Ogilvy questions whether Bede knew Marius of Avenches at first hand. Manitius (I, 79) believed that he did, and Professor Laistner agrees. This point was worthy of fuller discussion.

In the consideration of Bede's sources, reference might have been made to his request that his marginal notes indicating his indebtedness to the great Latin Fathers might be retained by copyists, a request which, as Father Sutcliffe (*Biblica*, VI, 1925, p. 205, note; VII, 1926, p. 428 sq.) and, after him, Professor Laistner showed (*J.T.S.* xxxiv, 1933, p. 350), was not ignored.

On p. 8, note 13, Mr Ogilvy says that he cannot trace the source of Bede's famous quotation from Ambrose which he made on his death-bed. 'Non ita inter vos vixi, ut pudeat me vivere: nec timeo mori; quia Dominum bonum habemus.' As Ambrose himself spoke them on his own death-bed, it is useless to search for them in his collected works. They are in c. 45 of his life by Paulinus, and Dr Dudden in his recent admirable biography of the Bishop of Milan reminds us, referring to Possidius' *Vita Augustini* (a book well known to Bede), that Augustine loved this saying.

There is little or no discussion of the evidence of manuscripts, and Mr Ogilvy is surely unfair (p. 45) when he tries to blame Hadrian and his 'African latinity' for the stylistic extravagances of Aldhelm. To reinforce this latter contention he seems to join with those who throw doubt upon the statement that Aldhelm studied at Malmesbury under the Irish

Abbot Maeldubh, but it is only right to say that he prefers not to dogmatize on such a point.

Indeed, Mr Ogilvy's whole attitude is so reasonable and his method so well-conceived that his readers will welcome the fulfilment of the hope expressed at the end of his Introduction that, in due course, this first essay will be followed by a more complete and definitive treatment of the subject.

F. J. E. RABY.

HARPENDEN.

Allegory in the French Heroic Poem of the Seventeenth Century. By ARCHIMEDE MARNI. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. viii+211 pp. 11s. 6d.

Évidemment, l'allégorie, en tant que procédé littéraire conscient, semble attirer en ce moment l'attention des critiques: il y a peu de temps, Mr C. S. Lewis faisait paraître sous le titre *The Allegory of Love* un ouvrage fort remarqué et qui méritait de l'être; Dr Archimède Marni vient d'étudier l'emploi de l'allégorie ou son abus dans la poésie héroïque française du XVII^e siècle. Cet intéressant sujet, très nouveau ou très négligé, à peu près indépendant de la question du merveilleux, est présenté ici avec beaucoup de compétence et d'intelligence. Ce n'est pas une simple curiosité d'histoire littéraire, l'allégorie n'est pas uniquement une question de mode; telle que notre auteur la définit, et telle que le XVII^e siècle l'a comprise, elle se présente à l'écrivain comme la méthode suprême grâce à laquelle il pourra faire de son œuvre le véhicule d'une leçon morale.

Le problème de l'allégorie n'est donc qu'une des faces d'un autre problème plus général que chaque génération est appelée à résoudre, celui des rapports de l'art et de la morale: l'objet final de l'œuvre littéraire est-il utilitaire? ou l'écrivain doit-il s'interdire toute arrière-pensée d'enseignement et de moralisation? On sait que l'école classique française dans son ensemble—Corneille est ici la seule exception notable—a donné au problème la solution utilitaire. Le poème héroïque, aussi cultivé à cette époque qu'il était peu lu, n'a pas échappé à la règle générale: il devait à sa grandeur même d'enseigner quelque chose au public.

Ce furent du reste les théoriciens, depuis Laudun d'Aygalliers jusqu'à Le Bossu, qui exigèrent que ce poème fût moralisateur, et par conséquent allégorique. L'expérience des siècles passés allait à l'encontre de la théorie: les grands poèmes héroïques, depuis l'*Iliade* jusqu'au *Roland furieux*, et même la *Franciade* (la *Divine Comédie* n'entrant naturellement pas en ligne de compte), n'avaient jamais été écrits pour inculquer une leçon morale. Le Tasse est la seule exception à cette règle; or c'est l'exemple du Tasse qui a prévalu sur tous les autres et c'est l'allégorie de la *Jérusalem délivrée*, en grande partie plaquée du reste après coup, qui s'est imposée à la grande majorité des poèmes héroïques français du XVII^e siècle.

Réelle aussi, mais bien loin d'être décisive, a été sur ce point l'influence de l'*Astrée*, des romans, de la pastorale; mais ce n'est certainement pas dans des œuvres occupant un rang aussi modeste dans la hiérarchie des

genres littéraires que les théoriciens sont allés chercher les règles du poème héroïque; c'est dans la logique de leurs théories préconçues sur les rapports de l'art et de la morale, autant et plus qu'en raison de leur admiration pour le Tasse, qu'ils ont fait de l'allégorie un élément essentiel du genre épique. Les auteurs, pour la plupart, se sont soumis à leurs exigences; ils ont donné un sens allégorique à leurs poèmes; quelques-uns n'y ont vu qu'une corvée qu'il fallait exécuter; les autres, plus nombreux, ont été convaincus qu'ainsi seulement ils pouvaient accomplir leur mission.

De tout cela quel profit l'art a-t-il pu tirer? La réponse n'est que trop évidente; la seconde partie du livre de M. Marni démontre amplement, s'il en est encore besoin, que l'art n'y a rien gagné, les œuvres sont toutes de la plus lamentable médiocrité. Ajoutons, pour être justes, que, considérant la non moins lamentable médiocrité des auteurs eux-mêmes, il n'y a rien perdu non plus.

F. J. TANQUEREY.

LONDON.

L'Œuvre et l'âme de Jules Renard. L'interprétation graphique, cinématographique et musicale des œuvres de Jules Renard. By LÉON GUICHARD. Paris: Nizet et Bastard. 1936. 2 vols. 602 and 228 pp. 70 fr.

Only sixteen years have elapsed since the death at an early age of the author of *Poil de Carotte* and in these two volumes he now receives the honours due to a classic. M. Guichard's study furnishes an excellent example of the scientific method and scholarly thoroughness characteristic of Docteur-ès-Lettres theses, and the perspicacity it displays as well as its attractive presentation are worthy of the highest praise. In the earlier and larger volume a couple of hundred pages of appendices include a list of the books (not complete, as the author recognizes) contained in Renard's library, very full bibliographies of the MSS., books, articles and lectures written or delivered by Renard (even to a reading of some pages of Hugo at Chaumont in 1901), critical works (books and articles wholly or partially concerned with Renard), a list of the number of performances annually of the plays with a note on the chief interpretations, and an iconographical section.

Renard is, in a word, treated as one of the 'grands seigneurs de la littérature' no detail of whose work is to be passed over as unimportant. The admirable meticulousness evinced in the critical apparatus is shown also in the treatment of the subject. A short biographical introduction is followed by excellent chapters on the early writings—before Renard found himself—on his reaction against current idealization of women, children, love, nature and animals, and a penetrating study of Renard as revealed in his works. M. Guichard succeeds in interesting us in the unattractive life of an unattractive man. Here and there, a phrase suggests that, despite his admiration for the artist, he found it hard to like the man. 'Renard, en effet, a usé beaucoup d'amis' (p. 178). 'Il a préféré, pour sa part, à peindre sans regarder, regarder, sans peindre, dans le silence des jaloux qui veulent que personne n'admire et n'aime

comme eux' (p. 183). From indications in his 'proses' and in the recently published *Journal* (fully utilized by M. Guichard), we can reconstruct the portrait of a timid, cantankerous, narrow-minded, untravelled petty bourgeois, still half peasant, quick to discover the seamy side of human nature and to note its crudities bleakly and unsparingly. In his character as outlined here, and in his work, all richness and generosity of nature seem wanting, and in their stead we discern a certain hard realism, almost a meanness of outlook, which delights to find a flaw in any object of beauty natural or human. He seems obsessed by a wretched fear of being duped, of being forced to admire. M. Guichard mildly hints, as does every obituary notice of any cross-grained individual, that underneath it all was a heart of gold, though the chief evidence for this would appear to be that Renard did not actively oppose the exercise of occasional charity by his wife.

The one saving grace, the unique quality of Renard, was his artistic conscience. He hated insincerity and was as pitiless a critic of himself as of others. His passion for truth was not confined to matters of style but extended to his treatment of his themes. In *Poil de Carotte*, for instance, though an autobiographical study of his own childhood, he courageously shows the unpleasant aspects of *l'enfant martyr* (which the film version minimizes), strong as the temptation to idealize must have been. The section of M. Guichard's main thesis (pages 239-369) which deals with the literary artist is excellent. He analyses with insight and sound æsthetic judgement the artistic achievement of Renard in a manner which makes this chapter a concise treatise on French style. At one point, perhaps, his admiration for the art of Renard leads him rather too far, as when he suggests (p. 310) that in the phrase 'Il me donne à toucher sa main fendillée', the adjective 'fendillée' condenses the whole of Flaubert's richly harmonized sentence describing the hands of Catherine Leroux.

M. Guichard, noting the twentieth century reaction against ornament and the modern cult of extreme simplicity and sobriety in painting, on the stage and in music, claims for Renard, not the rank of 'onlie begetter' but simply that of 'representative man'. In his second volume, after discussing in an interesting fashion the various renderings of Renard's work by illustrators, by the cinematograph (silent and talking film versions of *Poil de Carotte*) and in music, he concludes that only the musician (Maurice Ravel) has really achieved a translation of Renard into terms of another art.

Whether Renard will permanently occupy a high rank among French classics it is too early to judge. In any case *Poil de Carotte* and *Histoires naturelles* appear likely to endure as a unique and pungent expression of French naturalism during the closing years of the nineteenth century.

F. C. ROE.

J. K. Huysmans et la Belgique. By GUSTAVE VANWELKENHUYSEN. Paris: Mercure de France. 1935. 12 fr.

This small and concise book leaves one with a feeling of disappointment for it seems to promise much that it does not fulfil. Those interested in Huysmans had hoped to find in it new light thrown on the personality and the work of this author through an understanding of his connexion with Belgium and of its influence on him. In his opening remarks Vanwelkenhuysen says:

...cette étude, où un Huysmans aux traits connus se révèle sous un nouvel aspect, aidera, pensons-nous, à compléter et à préciser ce que l'on sait par ailleurs de l'homme et de l'écrivain.

Yet that is precisely what this study does not do—reveal Huysmans in any new light; it does not, in fact, reveal him in any light whatsoever. It is narrative and not critical, it does not group the facts so as to form a new picture but gives them baldly and not in a creative manner. It limits itself to an account of Huysmans' relations with certain Belgian writers—interesting here is the account of his friendship with Théo Hannon—of his connexion with certain periodicals; it relates the reception of his works in Belgium; it does not, however, try to generalize or to draw any conclusions from these facts. It makes no attempt to show the action of Belgium on Huysmans, nor his on that country. It does not make clear how he stands in relation to the most important movement in Belgian literary history, the literary renaissance of the *Jeune Belgique*. The author, however, endeavours to prepare us for this by saying:

Il nous a semblé que de longs commentaires ne pourraient que nuire à l'objectivité qu'on est en droit d'attendre de ce genre d'ouvrage. C'est pourquoi nous avons écarté les appréciations personnelles et laissé au lecteur le soin de juger quand et comme il lui plaira les faits et les opinions.

Yet a writer must give his readers a guiding line, must give them some inkling of the conclusions to which his wider reading has led him, he must not withhold the real fruit of his research. The book remains a rather arid collection of unrelated facts, which is not easy reading. There is, however, much material which will be of service to future students of Huysmans, though the value of the work is somewhat impaired through the absence of a comprehensive bibliography.

E. STARKIE.

OXFORD.

French Novelists of Today. By MILTON H. STANSBURY. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: H. Milford. 1935. vii + 220 pp. 9s.

It is difficult to discover for whom exactly this little work is intended. Is it for the reader who, knowing nothing of modern French literature, would like a guide through the tangled maze of contemporary fiction? Is it for those in whom a taste already exists and who would like to discover something about the authors who have taken his fancy? It does not seem to answer the needs of either reader. The writer, in his preface, says that his small volume aspires to present more intimately a restricted

number of writers rather than to trace a more comprehensive, and therefore colder, panorama. He admits that the volume is composed of short essays on those French novelists who have stimulated his own interests. This seems to one reader at least a mistaken conception. These separate articles are not linked together by any thread or plan, and the reader, on laying aside the book, is no more aware than he was before he started, of what French fiction really is to-day and of what are its main currents. The book would have gained in scope had there been in it some scheme however simple, some line of argument. The author talks of the patchwork of modern literature, yet a patchwork quilt to be really effective has some rudimentary and recognizable pattern. The volume would have been more helpful to the reader had the author shown this pattern, were his book able to be used as a map to the uncharted lands of modern French fiction.

He calls his work *French Novelists of Today*, yet he has not studied the writers he has chosen in their part as novelists, but rather as individual writers who happen to have written what they call novels; this is particularly noticeable in his article on Gide. There is no attempt to discuss the scope and function of fiction, what the novel is in France to-day, what these separate writers have made of it. Each article, however, taken separately is a sensitive and critical piece of work. The author shows taste and discrimination, and he is alive to the particular qualities of the writers he has studied; his critical talent is seen at its best when he is dealing with matters of style, very excellent in this respect is his article on Giraudoux. He is clever at singling out one special characteristic in his model and making that the centre point of his essay. One is somewhat reminded of French restaurant keepers who write, after their names, on the front of their shops, the culinary speciality on which their establishment prides itself. *Émile, ses fondues*, and *Louis, ses soles meunières*: thus one expects to find at the heading of the different chapters *Giraudoux, son style*, *Mauriac, son tourment*, and so forth.

Generally speaking, the most penetrating and successful article is perhaps that on Mauriac, which could with advantage be enlarged so as to form a whole book.

The author, in his preface, has stated that his choice of subjects was inspired not by the author as an artist, but by his representative and vivid personality. But many writers more representative and more vivid than those he has chosen could be found in modern French fiction. One misses the name of Bernanos, who has gone deeper than most modern French writers into the mysteries of conscience; of Giono, one of the greatest of the regional writers, of what may be a new form of country epic; of Marcel Aymé, one of the best representatives to-day of the eternal *esprit gaulois*.

E. STARKIE.

OXFORD.

Atlante Linguistico Etnografico Italiano della Corsica, promosso dalla R. Università di Cagliari. By GINO BOTTIGLIONI. Introduzione. [*L'Italia Dialectale*, Suppl. I, Serie II.] Pisa. 1935. 231 pp.

The appearance of Professor Bottiglioni's Introductory Volume coincides more or less with the publication of the fifth volume of his monumental Atlas. The complete work is to consist of ten volumes published at a total cost of L. 5000. The first volume contains a map of Corsica, and each of the subsequent volumes is accompanied by a drawing depicting Corsican customs, objects, etc., by the artist Guido Colucci. The Introductory Volume and an Index Volume are supplementary.

The volume under review is not merely an indispensable complement to the Atlas, but furnishes the author with the opportunity of re-affirming and developing those views on the principles and methods of linguistic geography which he had already stated in various articles and reviews. Profiting by the experiences and experiments of Gilliéron and Edmont and particularly by the re-orientation and methodological innovations brought about by Professors Jud and Jaberg, he has evolved methods of his own and has arrived at a conception of aims and principles which is of the greatest interest and cannot fail to make its influence felt in future developments of linguistic geography.

Of the *Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Südschweiz (AIS)* it may be said that its recordings have a purely individual and subjective value, representing only the momentary response of the person interrogated. Professor Bottiglioni considers this to fall short of what a linguistic atlas can and should achieve. It is part of his method that, in the hands of an expert investigator, the questionnaire should be so adapted or manipulated that it elicits the 'normal' response of the speakers of a particular region or locality. That is to say, he wishes his Atlas to record, not the immediate, unconsidered response of an individual *X* of a particular locality, but the self-critical, considered response of *X* as a typical representative of the locality. This implies an investigator equipped with a thorough knowledge of the linguistic, ethnological and social conditions of the whole field he has set himself to investigate. These qualifications Bottiglioni has been able to combine in his own person, as is testified by his own previous publications and by the intensive preparation extending from 1924 to 1928, the year in which the actual collecting of materials began.

While one must admit that such a method guards against some of the obvious defects revealed by other atlases, it is not clear, in spite of the detailed account given by Bottiglioni, how the necessary spontaneity in the subject can nevertheless be achieved or how one is to assess the degree of personal intervention by the investigator before the recorded reply was elicited. Thus, a comparison with Gilliéron's Atlas for Corsica shows the great advance made by Bottiglioni, but one cannot avoid the suspicion that the intervention of the investigator (Bottiglioni) has tended to minimize the extent of French influence and the vogue of neologisms, and that what we therefore have here is, in the main, an accurate portrayal of the native Italian dialect and its local variations rather than a

strictly objective picture of the linguistic condition of the island. An atlas compiled on these lines does, it is true, achieve a greater measure of objectivity, but it is the objectivity of the descriptive dialect study, and such an atlas must be interpreted differently from those hitherto published.

Professor Bottiglionni himself, if we understand him aright, would not hold that his precepts and practice represent any absolute ideal. They yield one (and in this case perhaps the best) of a number of possible answers to the question: What information should a linguistic atlas seek to convey? His position may be summed up in his assertion that for him the questionnaire does not represent the method to be followed in interrogating, but the end to be attained by every possible means. This is to say that the answers do not indicate how Bottiglionni asked his questions but express the things, thought and sentiments of which he has sought the most exact expression. Free renderings are therefore accepted and two or more alternative renderings are often recorded. Purely phonetic preoccupations give way to linguistic considerations in the widest sense.

The questionnaire consists of 1950 questions grouped under twenty headings, such as 'The Human Body' (325 phrases) 'Birth, Marriage, Death' (74 phrases), etc. A preponderant place is reserved for agricultural pursuits, arts and crafts. Various original features deserve special mention. The questionnaire consists exclusively of sentences or phrases, and a skilful use has been made of unfinished sentences which the speaker was expected to complete. The repetition of the same word or phrase at intervals in a different context provides a useful check on the variations to be expected in the speech even of an individual subject. The compilation of the questionnaire was determined partly by ethnographical considerations, many questions being designed to bring out local customs (e.g. the funeral dirge). Particular attention has been paid to proverbs and their local variants or equivalents. As a precautionary measure the questionnaire was tested at various places before being finally adopted for the actual investigation.

The selection of the places at which the inquiry was to be conducted resulted in few departures from the list of Gilliéron and Edmont. An interesting feature is the inclusion of the centres from which Tuscan and Sardinian influence emanated and still emanates: Northern Sardinia (2 points), Elba, Pisa, Lucca, Stazzema, bringing the total up to 55. Chapter II of the Introductory Volume gives a complete list of these with topographical, ethnographical and historical details, a number of photographs and indications of the date and duration of the inquiry. Chapter VI includes a list of the persons interrogated, with details of their age and trade or calling, the precise circumstances under which they were questioned, their reactions, etc.

Given Professor Bottiglionni's conception of aims and methods, one cannot but admire the carefully thought-out plan, the conscientious and unhurried investigation and the judicious sifting of the materials. The presentation of the results in the form of maps and accompanying notes is both clear and pleasing to the eye. Nothing has been left undone to

facilitate the exploiting of the material here accumulated, and the student will be grateful for such things as references to corresponding maps of the *AIS*. Chapter VIII gives an interesting account of the typographical and other technical difficulties which were encountered and successfully overcome. Thus, the indication of various geographical features (mountains and streams) has been made possible without any sacrifice of clearness or æsthetic effect.

The work reflects the highest credit on Professor Bottiglionni and on the University of Cagliari which sponsored the undertaking. It provides the Romance philologist not only with a wealth of linguistic material but also with an interesting methodological experiment on a generous scale. The student of ethnology and folklore will find recorded in it many characteristic elements of Corsican manners and customs.

A. EWERT.

OXFORD.

The Dolce Stil Novo according to Lorenzo de' Medici (a Study of his poetic 'Principio' as an Interpretation of the Italian Literature of the pre-Renaissance Period based on his 'Comento'). By ANGELO LIPARI. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xviii + 148 pp. 18s.

Der Platonismus in den Dichtungen Lorenzo de' Medicis. By AUGUST BUCK. (*Neue Deutsche Forschungen*, Bd. 86.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt; London: H. Milford. 1936. 114 pp. 3s. 6d.

A course of formal logic would, I fancy, be of assistance to some scholars particularly when they intend to deal with Dantean subjects, and I fear that Professor Lipari's book lends cogency to my suggestion. He has been impressed by Lorenzo's comment upon his own lyrics, and he argues that some of these sonnets being included in the *Raccolta aragonese*, for which he accepts the traditional date, 1455-6, cannot refer to the death of Simonetta; he consequently supposes that Lorenzo referred to mystic death, which becomes the key to the interpretation not only of Lorenzo's poetry, but of all poetry of *Stil Novo*. In so doing Professor Lipari overlooks that the novelty claimed by Lorenzo for his collection of sonnets is presumably to be traced to his inverting the Petrarchan, and natural, order which requires the *rime in vita* to precede the *rime in morte*, and that his interpretation thus annihilates the one novelty that Lorenzo discerned in his work. It is also to be observed that before publishing, if after writing, his book Professor Lipari's attention was called to certain works in which the date of the *Raccolta aragonese* is postponed by many years, although he was not aware that Miss Cotton, by ascertaining that the prefatory letter to the *Raccolta* is the work of Politian, has made the later date inevitable (cf. J. M. S. Cotton, 'Per l'attribuzione al Poliziano dell' epistola a don Federico d' Aragona', *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, CVI (1935), 282 pp.). In any case, after stressing his belief in the earlier date throughout the main part of his book and insisting upon the relevance of that date, he reluctantly

accepts the later one in an appendix and tries to argue that even so, the conclusion he has drawn from a contrary premise would stand. It would be unfair not to acknowledge that there are interesting remarks and clear evidence of much learning in this book, but no amount of enthusiasm and, I fear, of repetitions can get over the crude fact, that Professor Lipari's conclusions, even if right, cannot be proved by the means he has chosen to adopt.

Looking upon approximately the same subject Dr Buck has written a monograph in which excessive daring is so carefully suppressed, as to leave little room for original results; but his is a very useful, careful and eminently well balanced survey of Italian neo-Platonism in its effect upon poetry. It is to be regretted that Dr Buck has not read Dr Robb's *Italian Neo-Platonism*, for he might have spared himself the trouble of writing a rather meagre summary of the development of neo-Platonic thought in Italy, and he could then have probed more deeply into Lorenzo's neo-Platonism in connexion with which he does take the important *comento* into consideration without, however, ascribing to it an all-pervading significance as Professor Lipari has done. In the principal section of his monograph, Dr Buck illustrates Lorenzo's Platonism by pointing out its sources in the works of Ficino. The connexion is quite as close as might have been surmised, but Dr Buck makes it manifest by pointing out verbal similarities even in the few instances in which Lorenzo seems to have gone a little farther than his master had proceeded. And an impartial reader cannot but realize that the weakness of Professor Lipari's attractive theorizing is irremediably exposed by the orderly analysis of Dr Buck, which is as convincing as it is unpretentious. A comparison of Dr Buck's bibliography with that provided by Dr Robb gives disquieting results, for it shows the incompleteness of both, and there is no sufficient ground for holding that even by combining them the field is systematically covered. As for Professor Lipari he provides no bibliography at all.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

Glosarios latino-españoles de la Edad Media. By AMÉRICO CASTRO. (*Revista de Filología Española*, Anejo, XXII.) Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos. 1936. lxxxvii+378 pp. 25 ptas.

Behind the severe title of this work there is hidden a highly informative and novel study of mediæval scholarship in Spain and the relations between it and the vernacular culture. The study of *cultismos*, to which Sr Alonso devoted his recent work on Góngora's language, is extended here to the *semicultismos*. The interplay of the languages is complex, since there were tendencies at work to barbarize Latin and to latinize Spanish, conflicting with other tendencies to classicize Latin and purify the vernacular: these forces operated at different times with different force, or variously in different social circles. The data for their study are provided by three Latin-Spanish glossaries (Toledo, Escorial, Madrid Palace), which Sr Castro reproduces in full, together with an appendix

from the Escorial manuscript of schoolboy jokes, obscenities, snatches of song, proverbs and grammatical jottings. The lexicographical material is rearranged alphabetically, and explained so far as possible, and there are several pages of commentary on the Escorial appendix. Eighty-seven pages of introduction describe the manuscripts and the character of their latinity, discuss the teaching of grammar, and draw conclusions from the evidence as to language.

The three word-lists were drawn up during the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, probably in Aragon (as the handwriting and some words suggest), and certainly on the basis of a French forerunner. It is important to realize that their function was to supplement the international treatises and lexica which were the main sources of information concerning Latin. These lists are informal and ancillary; they contain specimens not only of serious Latin but of the jargon of the schools. For this reason they are accommodated in phonology and vocabulary to vernacular prejudices; they are a '*latín semievolucionado*', or *latinum circa romancium* as the older phrase went, similar to the 'notarial Latin' discovered by Sr Menéndez Pidal in Leonese documents of the tenth century and to the jargon used in inventories of church property. Those who used it were reasonably well-educated, since their Spanish is neither incorrect nor ultracorrect; but their Latin was for restricted and local circulation and would meet the eyes only of brother-lawyers, fellow-scholars or members of the same chapter or diocese. In this kind of semi-privacy Latin was allowed to develop on lines roughly parallel to the development of the vernacular. Latin seriously written had infinitely fewer barbarisms, scribal deformations, fantastic creations and general carelessness.

Both this *latinum circa romancium* and *latinum obscurum* affected the literary forms of the vernacular in a powerful manner. Sr Castro distinguishes five periods. I. In the period of vernacular origins the 'learned' vocabulary is restricted in quantity, and closely corresponds to the vernacular in its phonology. II. During the Alfonsine period, ending with the literary achievements of D. Juan Manuel, 'half-learned' words are not in favour. New words are adopted to describe new concepts, but they are left in their classical form, while search is made for a truly vernacular equivalent. 'El propósito estilístico del monarca no era latinizar, sino realzar el habla viva de las gentes, la cual interesa más que un vocablo nuevamente importado del latín, sólo usado cuando es preciso nombrar cosas nuevas; de ahí el ensanchamiento del castellano, las ampliaciones del sentido y el neologismo de sabor popular.' Thus, for instance, Alfonso X offers us the equation '*oráculo* (latín) = *oradero* (castellano)'. However, as the Castilian equivalent is a gloss on the foreign word and not self-sufficient, it is the Latin word which remains. Some 'half-learned' forms have given an exaggerated idea of the accommodation to vernacular prejudices of Alfonso's latinisms. Juan Ruiz recurs more frankly to the *latinum circa romancium*, and Pero López de Ayala, at the close of the century, seems less correct than D. Juan Manuel at its beginning. III. In the fifteenth century and early sixteenth heavy draughts are

taken from the vulgarized Latin, and it is notable that such borrowings should appear in the works of Encina and Lucas Fernández, both familiar with the school-Latin of Salamanca. IV. The Humanistic reaction corrected many mediæval errors, though it left standing some very familiar words and the mediæval treatment of consonant groups. Nebrija is the coryphaeus of this regeneration. But if we adopt these divisions, we should allow for a double tendency in the fifteenth century; for, while some writers were importing vulgarized terms into their vocabulary, others, like Santillana and Mena, were striving after effects more classical than those of Alfonso and his age. V. The academic latinism of the eighteenth century and after. Latin words are no longer treated with vernacular freedom, but *extranjerismos* are required to conform to Spanish habits before they are fully nationalized. Perhaps a later age may not even insist on this test. In our country there is already a strong feeling that French loan-words should retain their French pronunciation, and not be accommodated to English prejudices as once they were.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Die Formen des Sonetts bei Lope de Vega. By OTTO JÖRDER. (Beihefte zur ZRP, 86.) Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. 372 pp. RM. 22.

'El soneto está bien en los que aguardan.' Lope wrote 1587 sonnets—the critical catalogue alone occupies one-fourth of Dr Jörder's book—over half of which appear in his plays. *El Perro del Hortelano* contains nine. For a drama based first and foremost on action that might indicate a prodigious deal of waiting; but to seek to surprise new secrets of Lope's technique along these lines, as one may with Shakespeare's songs, would doubtless be a fruitless task, and Dr Jörder does not attempt it. At best, we believe, it would but strengthen the impression that, just as much of Lope is less drama than theatre, so many aspects of his plays are less theatre than literary artifice. Even his best bear witness to the ravages of the pastoral convention, and if his characters of all ranks mouth sonnets until the poking of fun at them becomes a stock device of the *gracioso*, it is because the sonnet was perhaps the most imperious of the many fashions dangled before the Renaissance *bel esprit*.

The analysis of Lope's vast production in the kind does nonetheless suggest to Dr Jörder a possible new approach to the plays, from the point of view of chronology. From a study chiefly of the two norms for the sextet, *cdcdcd* (A) and *cdecde* (B)—varieties of the latter occur so sporadically as not to count—the predominance of A to B, as 5 to 2 in the total, emerges as the result of a gradual evolution from the *Arcadia* of 1598, where they are as 1 to 11, to the Burguillos *Rimas* of 1634, where they stand as 160 to 1; and this criterion, broadly corroborated by the plays of known date and correlated with other inferences likewise based on sonnet usage, enables Dr Jörder to advance at least a *terminus ante quem*, or to modify one hitherto accepted, for some fifty plays out of 292 containing sonnets. Whether his conclusions shall stand 'mit so gut wie

voller Gewissheit' other considerations must determine, but every step towards a surer Lope chronology strengthens the foundations of the ultimate critical edifice. In this Dr Jörder's pioneer investigation may well prove of the first importance.

Literary criticism proper Dr Jörder eschews, and even, somewhat arbitrarily, other elements of sonnet structure: 'Versbau und Reimgestaltung schlechthin müssen und können im Rahmen dieser Arbeit ausser Betracht bleiben.' Yet an analysis of the Lope hendecasyllable too might conceivably lead to chronological conclusions of value. But the review of special forms, with 'estrambote', in 'versos esdrújulos, agudos, de cabo roto', and of the many others that bear witness chiefly to Lope's endless virtuosity, sonnets with echo, sonnets that ring the changes on the vowel sequence, that turn on word-play, or that alternate lines in Spanish, Portuguese, Italian and Latin—this has been carried out with such thoroughness and erudition as to leave the regret only that it seems to lead nowhere in particular.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

Luís de Camões, i: o lírico. By HERNANI CIDADE. (*Revista da Faculdade de Letras de Lisboa*, III, 1 e 2.) Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional. 1936. 342 pp.

Though Professor Cidade's work takes the form of an article in a review, it is none the less an entire book, and one of such interest that it calls for prompt notice. For various reasons it is necessary for English readers to take their Portuguese studies in large blocks. It is not possible to follow the course of new discoveries or new opinions as they trickle through a large number of scarcely accessible periodicals. We must wait until a revision takes place, and this essay by Professor Cidade is the first part of a revision of one who 'was a literature in himself'. For us the last such volume was Mr Bell's excellent little biography. Dr Cidade goes back, however, to Storck. It was Storck who read into Camões' lyrics details of his life, authorized by the poet's cry

Nem eu delicadezas vou cantando
co'o gosto do louvor, mas explicando
puras verdades já por mi passadas.
Oxalá foram fábulas sonhadas!

That is still true. Dr Cidade points out that what Camões expresses in his verses, despite their Petrarchan form and terminology, is always an experience that has been *lived*. But to identify and describe those experiences involves assigning definite and concrete senses to words which may have been hyperbolic or allegorical. Storck composed a romance, a romance in the poet's own words and not only plausible but probable. At least the romance brought into relation with each other poems and phrases similar in sense or expression, and so was a valuable key to the lyrics. But the identifications may have been too precise, and they lead to exaggeration in the latest style of imaginative biography,

as when Virginia de Castro e Almeida (*Vie de Camoens*, Paris, 1934, p. 138) writes:

Camões pensait à tous ceux qu'il avait aimés, et qui avaient cessé de vivre: son oncle Dom Bento; son élève Dom Antonio; Dom Alvaro et tant d'autres amis: les meilleurs toujours, le sang le plus noble, le plus ardent, le plus généreux, s'échappant des veines de la Patrie épuisée. Et Nathercia... Nathercia, son seul amour, Nathercia qui, en mourant, avait emporté de ce monde tout ce qui valait la peine d'être vécu... etc.

Apart from the difficulty of knowing what Camões thought within himself while crossing the Bay of Bengal, the paragraph is a tissue of legends for the most part already exploded.

Dr Cidade's most notable service is to cut away this jungle and bring us to the original void. The words *desterro*, *desterrado*, and the like, are often on Camões' lips, but often in the sense of absence. In no case is it certain that they mean more than absence. Thus the famous 'exiles' of Ribatejo, Ceuta and India are revealed to be hypotheses, and some of them are not even plausible. What kind of exile was it to go from Lisbon a few miles up the Tagus valley? The exile of India is referred to as at least partly voluntary. But with the exiles, there disappears the need to specify the imprudent or bad conduct which might have caused them: we merely know that the poet once wounded a royal servitor during a Corpus Christi celebration, but so might any quarrelsome *fidalgos* of the age. And if we have neither exiles nor misconduct, we have ever so much less reason to identify the mistress of his sonnets (the supposed source of both) with any individual. The sonnets and other lyrics give us a choice of names, and the most moving are anonymous. The lady in them is as lofty and absolute as a troubadour's mistress should be, a 'sun among stars'; and she uses her supremacy to humiliate the lover:

Ora, emfim, sublimai vossa vitória,
senhora, com vencer-me e cativar-me:
farei dela no mundo larga história.

Or should *senhora* have a capital *S* and refer to the Princess Maria in her court of poetry and gallantry? That has been argued by the leading Portuguese Camonian, Dr José M. Rodrigues, and accepted by the distinguished poet Sr Afonso Lopes Vieira and (apparently) by the late Dona Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos. It would account handsomely for the imprisonments and exiles—but we do not know that there were any! The princess's name is not given in Camões' works nor linked with him by any authority. We do have Couto's authority for *Dinamene*, a Chinese slave; at least Dr Cidade reports that opinion accepts as probably genuine the fragmentary and still unpublished *Década*. Dr Afrânio Peixoto's suggestion (*Ensaios camonianos*, Coimbra, 1932, pp. 97 and 98) that her name may have been *Ti-nan-men* should probably be dropped as unhelpful. *Dinamene* is not only the name of an obscure nymph in Homer, but of a quite important one in Garcilaso's third *égloga*, and Garcilaso was often in Camões' thoughts. A slave-girl would probably have a 'flower name' in two syllables and not be referred to solemnly by a surname; and the combination *Ti-nan-men* seems devoid of any

possible sense (the most coherent translation seems to be 'Miss South-gate Earth'!).

Nathercia, it seems, must go. I am rather sorry, because I liked her. Dr Rodrigues is implacable against the *mito naterciano* which Storck made so fresh and romantic, and he has expelled the sonnets which named her. It is true that the roundel

Catarina bem promete;
ora a má! como ela mente!

remains; but that Catherine may not have been *de Ataíde* or any actual Catherine. In making excisions of this kind and others in the admittedly swollen mass of *Camonianana*, the learned editor of the *Lírica de Camões* (Coimbra, 1932) did not give his reasons. Indeed, in a separate essay he went so far as to say that such a proceeding would be waste of time:

Fazer uma verdadeira monografia de cada poesia de Camões, com a indicação de todas as variantes, seria trabalho inútil para o fim que os editores se propuseram.
(*A tesis da Infanta na Lírica de Camões*, Coimbra, 1933, p. 39.)

Unfortunately this is hardly the case. The Camonian apocrypha also have their history as part of the poet's posthumous fame, and they are of very various degrees of credibility. Especially when an edition is linked to a thesis, one wants to know in more detail why we no longer are given pieces unfavourable to that thesis. An important service of Dr Cidade's book is the attention he has devoted to the Coimbra edition, and his insistence on the need for the fullest possible explanations. For lack of these one must go back sometimes to Storck and Juromenha.

The remainder of the book deals with the formation of the poet, his themes and confidences, and his art as revealed in the lyrics, themselves the school which educated the singer of the *Lusiadas*. These discussions occupy most of the book and are of great interest. One cannot enter into details, for that would require a long essay traversing all the same ground; but one section is crucial. The comparison between Camões and Petrarca is inevitable and has often been made. It is important for both poets. Never has it been done so well as by Dr Cidade, whose treatment may well remain definitive. In comparing Camões with his Spanish predecessors, it is odd and illuminating to see how generously he drew on Boscán. Boscán, he says, knows the secrets of poetry, though he cannot utter them with the smooth sweetness of Garcilaso.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

A Reinterpretation of the Expository Verses of the Hildebrandslied. By EMIL T. H. BUNJE. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Publications in Modern Philology. Vol. xviii, No. 5, pp. 291-442. 1936. \$1.50.

Mr Bunje believes that in lines 1-5 of the unique manuscript in Cassel there is more than meets the eye, particularly in the space where H. Pongs in 1913 claimed to see '*r=s*'. Enlargements from the Sievers

facsimile of 1872 reveal to him no trace of *s*, but a *t*, which gives a new reading, 'sunu fatar ungot' (the son hostile to the father), and an interpretation differing from the reactions to *sunufatarungo* of 131 authors dating from 1729 to 1933, carefully tabulated and analysed on pp. 294–311. The discoverer must be allowed to speak for himself:

This is probably what happened. The monk who wrote the lay had almost completed the letter 't' when his quill caught, . . . spurted ink far and wide, and obliterated the right half of the crossbar with a fair-sized blot. He then removed the letter with a moist swab and, having wet this part of the parchment, carried on with majuscule 'I' . . . Finally, the monk forgot to insert the 't' when the vellum had dried. He also omitted to erase the smaller blots further afield.

In other respects the reinterpretation diminishes the number of scribal sins of omission and commission: *d&* is to mean something at last, and the extra syllable in *fatereres* denotes scorn—'of that father of mine' (p. 315).

Pp. 319–383 deal with the *urhettun* . . . *muotin* problem. Here the author is inclined to go with the majority. 'There must be something' to account for the preponderance 57 : 45 in favour of *urhettun* as a verb. This statistical method, if universally adopted, would stay the advance of knowledge, for obviously the odds must always be *n* to 1 against anything new, such as *ungot*. Braune's *muotin* from *muoen* is kept out of the discussion on pp. 345–383, being in a minority of 2 : 102 in the tabulation, which does not include editions 4–9 of the *Lesebuch* or the names of Helm and Holthausen. A census of unpublished opinion at the present time would give a different result, but the figures are of as little importance here as the indecisive battle of the *-un*'s and *-in*'s (pp. 346–359). Whichever side may be awarded the victory, the meaning of *muotin* remains unchanged, and only partisan grammarians are affected. However, the conclusion on p. 372 is that *muotin* as a verb 'lacks confirmation on all counts', and the hand of Sievers lying heavily on this investigator, he accepts the grotesque alliteration on *h* for line 1 (on two verbs!), although a contrast-stress, as in 'Ich hörte das sagen', or 'I heard it said', would imply that before the year 800 people took in what was said to them by some other sense-organ than the ear. I do not press an alternative theory that the *scop* was a deaf-mute who had learnt lip-reading, or the emendation *Ik sah ðat seggen*.

A matter of some bibliographical interest must be mentioned. Mr Bunje believes that the dot after *sunufatarungo* recorded by Grimm, 1812, was added to the MS. with a steel pen about 1845, since the 1830 lithograph does not show it. Strange to say, Fig. 1, p. 312, shows it as black as sin, but in Fig. 2, another enlargement of the same small area of the 1872 facsimile, the dot is not there. It seems to have exploded, and re-assembled some fragments in a form suggesting a 't'. If a lens may have a blind spot, or a mere change of focus, p. 311, p. 313, can cause such hocus-pocus, we must be on our guard against camera-work. On p. 313 it is questioned whether 'the 1812 text of the Grimm brothers is worth serious consideration?' I should say, most decidedly, 'Yes'. Their *Urkundlicher Text* reproduces what can be seen in the photographic facsimiles with remarkable fidelity, as well as some details now blacked out

by the filthy smudges left by well-meaning vandals with chemicals. Of course there are some mistakes and disputed readings. But the list of errors imputed on p. 427 to 'Grimm's text of 1812' compared with the Sievers facsimile is astounding. Recovering from a state of stupefaction I find that Mr Bunje has used a defective copy, a sort of *proof before letters*, lacking the promised insertions made by hand which 'wir sorgfältig hinzuschreiben lassen' (p. 28). My own copy leads me to the conclusion that seventeen bricks, which J. and W. Grimm did *not* drop in 1812, have come down out of the clear sky of California, rather heavily, in the year 1936. We live dangerously.

To counteract any unfavourable impression, I must add that this work is most valuable for those who wish to sift or supplement the three thousand pages of comment on the fascinating *Hildebrandslied*. My only regret is that it covers no more than the first five lines.

W. PERRETT.

LONDON.

Deutsches Wörterbuch. By HERMANN PAUL, Fourth Edition, edited by KARL EULING. Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1933-5. viii + 688 pp. 18 M.

The first edition of this work appeared in 1896, and the general plan that Paul followed then has not been interfered with in subsequent editions. As against so many of his colleagues among the 'Junggrammatiker' Paul did not possess the romantic contempt for modern speech-material, still less did he subscribe to the notion, widely prevalent at the time, that a modern form was only worthy of notice if it was, in some way or other, 'old'. To Paul, excellent philologist though he was, mediæval and even older stages of the language were of little value unless he could utilize them in showing the influences that have moulded modern speech. His voluminous German Grammar was less concerned with documenting gradual growth than with elucidating the modern language historically, and his dictionary, from the very start, pursued a similar aim. It was never intended that it should give an exhaustive list of words or meanings, and hardly any attention is paid to obvious derivatives and compositions made from root-words that are discussed. Paul was especially interested in dialect-variants in so far as they were permissible in the standard language with 'landschaftliche Färbung'. All his life he never ceased to attack the artificial 'Bühnensprache', and his dictionary contains much interesting and useful information on variant usage.

To Paul, modern German began with Luther, to whose linguistic habits he devoted much of his time. He was particularly attracted to the changes in form and meaning that have made themselves apparent in Germany during the last four hundred years, and copious material is given under the more important head-words in which these changes can be adequately and profitably studied. Thus there is constant reference to the usage of Luther, frequently seventeenth-century authors are drawn upon, and much material is culled in particular from the classical writers

of the eighteenth century. Every page of the dictionary has quotations that show the linguistic habits of Wieland, Herder, Goethe and Schiller. Among nineteenth-century writers, a good deal of attention is paid to Grillparzer, particularly when this poet is a representative of Austrian speech. If a word or a meaning occurs in a classical writer, it is frequently quoted even if there is little modern evidence for survival. Thus we find on p. 7: 'abludern' from Kleist, 'abmarachen' from Immermann, the note: 'Abmessung' gebrauchen Lessing und Kant für 'Dimension', 'abregnen' from Goethe.

Paul never intended that his book should be a rival to Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. There are very few references to the older stages of the Germanic languages. Generally, historical information goes back no further than Middle High German.

Dr Karl Euling, who has for years been engaged on work for Grimm's still far from complete *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, has confined his attention largely to bringing the evidence and the conclusions up to date, wherever this has become desirable. It is an abiding tribute to the scholarship of Paul that very few alterations have been necessary that have not arisen out of recent research. Dr Euling has also provided much new and valuable material on dialect differences, partly from his own collections, partly from Kretschmar, *Wortgeographie der deutschen Umgangssprache* and the late Otto Behaghel's monumental *Deutsche Syntax*.

This dictionary shares the rare distinction for a work of such a nature with the *New English Dictionary* that it can be read continuously with both enjoyment and interest, and no student of modern German literature can afford to neglect the rich material that has here been collected.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

Studien zu Wort und Stil bei Brockes. By HARRY W. PFUND. New York: New York University. (*Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs* No. 21.) 1935. 218 pp.

In the fifth number of the *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde*, 1936, Gerhard Fricke wrote: 'Sie [die Aufgabe des Poeten im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert] ist wesentlich eine Aufgabe sprachlicher Kunstfertigkeit. . . und formaler Technik—nicht eine Aufgabe der Seele und der symbolschaffenden, künstlerischen Schöpferkraft.' One would expect an analysis of Brockes to counteract this extremely biased view. The very detailed work of Pfund helps to restore the balance from the traditionalist standpoint by showing the limits of Brockes' formal indebtedness to the Silesians; but in spite of careful documentation and his intensive study of seventeenth-century poetics, the writer has not, I think, defined his view of the poetic impulse in the baroque age or in the work of the 'berühmten Verehrer göttlichen Geschöpfs in Blumen'. He might argue that this lies beyond the scope of his book as stated in the Introduction—'Nicht der Gehalt der Dichtungen. . . geht uns hier an, sondern ihre Sprache und ihr Stil'. But he is logically obliged to make assertions which involve the wider issue; and it seems reasonable to challenge such phrases as these:

'Die Schlesier haben die Natur nicht in ihrem wahren Wesen erschaut und erfasst' (p. 31); 'von letzterer [der erlebten Antinomie] kann bei dem freisinnigen Brockes, dem Freunde des Reimarus, der schon in der reinen Aufklärung steht, nicht die Rede sein' (footnote p. 62); 'Zeitwende... zwischen dem kümmerlichen 17. und dem aufsteigenden 18. Jahrhundert' (pp. 87-8).

The sound merits of the work will not be denied. It is an ordered analysis of Brockes' writings under the rubrics of 'Steigerung, Bildersprache, sonstige Besonderheiten' [including the conceit, antithesis, expression of horror and astonishment, this latter excellently handled by Pfund], 'Wortbildung, Wortschatz'. The chapter on word-formation seems to lack the attempt at a final conclusion, though the arrangement of categories is exemplary. Here the problem of 'braune Nacht' and 'grüne Nacht' is again approached; it may be possible to arrive at a conclusion, but not, I think, until the art critic and the philologist have joined forces more effectually than they have hitherto done. Here, as elsewhere, Pfund's bibliographies (including that in the third appendix) are of considerable value within the philologist's range.

In a discussion of the 'conchetto' a clear statement of the Italian use would be welcome, especially in a study of the translator of the 'Strage degli Innocenti'. For the technique of translation is, after all, involved in a discussion of style; and it would be good to dwell rather more upon Brockes' rendering of Marino (for example upon his occasional laboured extensions of the Italian phrase) and rather less upon the 'Jahreszeiten' which, as Kurt Gjerset claimed many years ago, is a somewhat senile work.

Of great practical use is the careful list of foreign words employed by Brockes—a formidable and startling collection, as Pfund rightly insists. The presentation of dialect material is in itself good; but I am inclined to query the statement (p. 125), applied to Brockes among others, that the poems in dialect reveal 'ganz andere Menschen'; 'humorvolle Drastik' is certainly characteristic of his epithalamium in Plattdeutsch; but the words 'lucubreert' and even 'meriteren' in a dialect poem not mentioned specifically by Pfund (*Poesie der Niedersachsen*, II, 51) give more than a hint of the scholar lurking behind the mask of the simple Niedersachse. In connexion with the former poem, it is possibly correct to say that the erotic element is almost entirely lacking from Brockes' poetry (p. 42, p. 197, varied on p. 88 to 'die Erotik spielt bei unserm Dichter keine Rolle'); but the rare occurrence of it might have been briefly discussed: was the translation of Marino's 'Baci' merely an intellectual exercise?

One might perhaps expect in Pfund's extensive bibliography the inclusion of the 'Unverwelcklich-blühendes Ehren-Mahl dem Weyland... Herrn Karl Wilhelm...' in the edition published by the Heidelberg Akademie der Wissenschaften (*Sitzungsberichte*, 1930-1); this is valuable rather for Gundolf's short prefatory remarks on Brockes' style than for the intrinsic interest of the opusculum (for Gundolf seems to have been unaware that the 'Gelegenheitsgedicht' which he had discovered had been incorporated in the sixth volume of the 'Irdisches Vergnügen').

Pfund's work, easy of reference and based upon searching analyses, will be welcomed, even if its conclusions are challenged, by all who wish to estimate Brockes' transitional significance between the Silesians, or even, as Hankamer suggests, Simon Dach, on the one side, and Klopstock and Schiller on the other.

W. F. MAINLAND.

LONDON.

Freundschaftskult und Freundschaftsdichtung im deutschen Schrifttum des 18. Jahrhunderts vom Ausgang des Barock bis zu Klopstock. By WOLFDIETRICH RASCH. Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. 266 pp. 11 M.

This is a study in 'Motivgeschichte' on the lines of Professor Kluckhohn's *Auffassung der Liebe*, but with more emphasis on the sociological aspects of the subject. It deals in the main with the first half of the eighteenth century, down to Klopstock and the Bremer Beiträger, but the author rightly claims that his interpretation of the historical situation which made the Freundschaftskult possible can be applied to the whole century.

An introductory chapter sketches earlier conceptions of friendship, particularly those current among the Humanists and the writers of the Baroque age. 'Freundschaft ist im Barock eingebettet in die gesellschaftlichen Bindungen', Dr Rasch finds, and is not yet regarded as a substitute for them. Poems on the theme of friendship have still usually a social function to perform; they are addressed in gratitude to patrons or they convey birthday or marriage greetings and the like, in conventional forms going back to the Humanists. In *Simplicissimus*, however, with the friendship between the hero and Herzbruder, we are already 'dicht vor der Auflösung der noch bindenden Ganzheit, dicht vor dem Sichöffnen einer neuen Welt des Einzelnen und der Innerlichkeit'.

Before describing eighteenth-century Freundschaftsdichtung in detail Dr Rasch investigates the tendencies towards a Freundschaftskult in the religious thought of the Pietists as well as in the secular thought of the Rationalists. He also devotes a very full chapter to the political and social soil in which it flourished, for, as he says, 'die Verbreitung der pietistischen Frömmigkeit und Seelenhaltung wie die breite Aneignung der Aufklärungsanschauungen waren nur möglich durch die Aufnahmebereitschaft, die gewisse Schichten infolge ihrer sozialen Lage diesen Lehren entgegenbrachten'.

Pietism favoured the growth of a friendship cult through the formation of innumerable small groups of people out of touch with organized religion yet not attracted by the worldliness of the courts, 'eine neue Art menschlicher Beziehungen, die auf das Religiöse begründet sind, aber damit eben nicht auf ein Allgemeines, objektiv Gültiges, sondern auf den Austausch der innersten, persönlichsten Angelegenheiten der Seele'. Pietism, like the modern Oxford Movement, encouraged a substitute for confession, though it was to individual friends rather than to groups that the Pietists unbosomed themselves. Heart to heart talks and soul-searching exchanges of letters naturally fostered intimate friendships, as

well as a withdrawal from the ordinary life of society. Such a friendship offered some of the consolations associated with religion and tended to become an end in itself.

If Pietism had in some respects fostered interest in the individual and his psychology, and diverted it from the official churches and even from thoughts of another world, Rationalism went still further in this direction, with individualistic theories about social origins and its advocacy of humanitarianism on rational, secular grounds. A 'rational love' of mankind and of individual men became the basis of virtue and of social contentment. The ideas of Shaftesbury in this connexion, advocating 'gegenüber der christlichen transzendenten Moral eine diesseitige Tugend, die in Freundschaft und Vaterlandsliebe beispielhaft erscheint', echoed and re-echoed through German literature down to the end of the century.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in a valuable book is the one headed 'Freundschaft, Gesellschaft und Staat', in which the friendship cult is viewed in its relation to the social and political life of the times. 'Pietismus und Aufklärung und ihre Weiterbildungen', says Dr Rasch, 'das sind die Formen, in denen das Bürgertum gegen seine unterdrückte Lage protestiert, sich eine Zuflucht schafft, neue Lebensinhalte erwirbt und schliesslich seine eigne Geltung gewinnt'. A new élite was to be formed, whose members should aspire to intellectual and æsthetic culture as their highest personal aim and regulate their relations with their neighbours on the basis of friendship, for this had to take the place of all other bonds between men, to satisfy all social needs and impulses, even providing, for Klopstock and the new 'Freundschaftsbünde' he inspired, with their twin ideals of friendship and patriotism, the only grounds in reality for their awakening national consciousness. It was not the whole of the middle class of course that made such extravagant claims on friendship, but this interpretation does seem to explain much of the otherwise unaccountable fervour of those for whom friendship did become a cult. It canalized emotions normally directed to quite different objects.

The second half of the book traces the expression of these new notions of friendship in the moral weeklies and in individual German writers down to Klopstock, sifting a mass of dull writings with conscientious thoroughness. This had to be done to explain the literary tradition behind *Don Carlos*, *An die Freude* and the like, but the study of the strange phenomenon which the friendship cult itself presents is the real subject of the book. Dr Rasch has handled it with great skill and learning and produced a book of lasting value for every student of the eighteenth-century German mind.

W. H. BRUFORD.

EDINBURGH.

Le Lied allemand et ses traductions poétiques en France. Lieds et Ballades germaniques traduits en vers français. (Essai de bibliographie critique.) By EDMOND DUMÉRIL. (*Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée*, Nos. 98 and 99.) Paris: H. Champion. 1934. 402 and 297 pp.

The latter of these two volumes to a large extent supplements and completes the first, and for the purpose of this review the two studies should, therefore, be considered together. From the very nature of the subject the plan and classification of the first volume presented themselves naturally to the author. He was first obliged to examine as carefully as possible the historical background and the literary conditions under which the German Lied first gained entry into France, where under the strong influence of the Romantic movement it became more and more naturalized. He subsequently works out in three principal parts the solution of the following three problems: (1) Pourquoi le lied allemand a-t-il séduit nos poètes traducteurs? (2) Comment le lied a-t-il été traduit? (3) Quelle est l'utilité des traductions des lieds?

In the attempt to answer the first question the author inevitably comes up against that doubtful element which is peculiar to every translation of a poetic work, and which has always given cause for keen controversy. Rightly for his purpose he leaves to one side the uncompromising attitude which Shelley has taken up in his 'Defence of Poetry': 'Hence the vanity of translation; it were as wise to cast a violet into a crucible that you might discover the formal principle of its colour and odour, as seek to transfuse from one language into another the creations of a poet. The plant must spring again from its seed, or it will bear no flower—and this is the burthen of the curse of Babel'. This is moreover an assertion which Shelley himself did not uphold in practice, when we think of his own verse translations of ancient hymns, or of the 'Scenes from Goethe's Faust'. After a prolonged enumeration of many different points of view concerning poetic translations Dr Duméril follows the demands put forward by Novalis, and which culminate in the following statements: 'Le vrai traducteur "libre" doit être en réalité l'artiste lui-même pour pouvoir rendre de telle ou telle manière, à son gré, l'idée fondamentale de l'œuvre. Il doit être le poète du poète et pouvoir par conséquent faire parler le poète à la fois d'après ses idées à lui et d'après les siennes.' To see these demands met and satisfied we have only to turn to modern poets like George and Rilke, who, in their translations of poetry—though their resulting achievements were of a completely different character—both captured the masterly touch of the model itself, and with the re-creation of the original enriched the German language at the same time with unsuspected possibilities, as Hölderlin had done before them with his translations of ancient poetry.

A special chapter is devoted to an attempt to interpret the French conception of the Lied, and to show how it has to some extent developed into the antithesis of the German conception: 'Le mot lied évoque immédiatement dans notre esprit deux idées inséparables; mélodie et épanchement du cœur. Ce genre de poésie appartiendrait donc par essence au plus pur lyrisme. Quant à sa forme, ce serait celle de la poésie

primitive, où la modulation musicale s'ajoutait toujours à la cadence des syllabes.' Equally important is the following statement: 'Populaire ou artistique, naturel ou cultivé, le vrai lied doit toujours, pour la forme, produire l'impression d'un chant spontané, musical, exempt de toute convention, de tout cliché littéraire. Dans le lied idéal, les trois éléments indispensables—forme rythmique, images matérielles et état d'âme ne font qu'un, si parfaite est leur adaptation.'

The second part of the book is predominantly historical, and deals with the manner in which the Lied secured a footing in France before, during and after the Romantic movement. The champions of these three epochs are successively, Mme de Staël for the pre-Romantic period; Gérard de Nerval and Henri Blaze for the Romantic epoch; and, finally, for the post-Romantic period most notably Édouard Schuré.

The central point of the whole work lies in a methodical scrutiny and estimation of all the Lieder translated into French between 1790 and 1890, and in this way valuable evidence of the taste of the French public is revealed. From the second volume we learn that the distinction of being the most frequently translated Lied falls to the 'König von Thule' (34 times). Next come 'Gretchen am Rade' (21), 'Das Lied von der Glocke' (20), 'Erlkönig' (19), 'Der Fischer' (18), 'Kennst du das Land...' (16), 'Lenore' (14), and only after a wider interval 'Die Lorelei' (10), 'Die Grenadiere' (6), and such well-known Lieder as 'Der gute Kamerad' (only 3) and 'Heidenröslein' (only 2). Taking Lieder and Ballads together Goethe has first place with 265 translations in all, but is almost equalled by Heine with 252. If we disregard, however, the ballads and translations from Faust we are able to establish a much greater diffusion of Heine's lyrical output, and in the field of the Lied as such Heine appears as the most popular and most representative of all German poets. After Goethe and Heine comes Uhland with 179 translations, whilst Schiller lags a long way behind with 132.—The 'Volkslied', in the sense in which we have understood this term since Herder, has only seldom been taken up, and for the most part by inferior poets. 'Le lied populaire est demeuré pour les Français qui n'étaient ni germanistes ni musiciens, un objet de curiosité à peu près inconnu.'

If we were disposed to find fault with this really useful study, we should describe it as over-liberal of condensed information. But we prefer to conclude with the positive note that Dr Duméril has given us a work of research which might with profit find its counterpart in other countries.

K.-W. MAURER.

LONDON.

Max Dauthendey. Poet-Philosopher. By H. WENDT. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. 177 pp. 15s.

It often proves dangerous to extract the philosophical essence from the work of a poet. Wendt has not escaped this danger and his book suffers from the fact that the poet Dauthendey disappears beneath the heavy and even burdensome weight of the thoughts and philosophy attained

during his strange and arduous life. Dauthendey (1867–1918) is a most interesting representative of German, or better, European Impressionism, beginning in the early nineties under the influence of the then dominant natural sciences (hence his 'atomistic' period), but striving for a deeper penetration of world and life and thus being led through an all-embracing universalism to the discovery of a personal God. His most important period is the middle one which brings him close to Alfred Mombert, Hugo von Hofmannsthal and many other contemporary writers whose positive affirmation of life created a spirit of high festivity, revelling in luxury of colour, light and beauty and opening the subtlest senses of perception and enjoyment. Dauthendey has given this spirit of festivity a philosophical basis, widening it to 'World-Festivity', which is grasped actively through 'World-Proximity', passively through 'World-Detachment', both expressions of an emotionally experienced festive mood. Wendt follows the development of Dauthendey's philosophy (which, by the way, while not very original is 'experienced') with scrupulous accuracy, though not avoiding abstractness and schematization. For the mere descriptive method of treatment some excuse may be found in the great difficulties created for any investigator by the huge output of this poet-philosopher (2 novels, 3 volumes of short-stories, 12 dramas, 14 volumes of poetry and many autobiographical works). A more critical point of view, however, and an attempt to link up Dauthendey with the intellectual, social and historical forces of his time would have increased the value of the book. Nevertheless, the study is of special value for those whose interest turns towards this very rich and fairly uncharted period of pre-war Germany. Wendt presents abundant material, partly placed at his disposal by Frau Dauthendey. Apart from his thorough knowledge of the poet's work and of critical literature concerning him, he bases his research largely on unpublished letters, diaries and poems. Many references to Dauthendey's life and relations with his friends are found throughout the book. The appendices are of considerable value for the student; e.g. the first publication of the poet's 22 early poems ('Meine ersten Gehversuche auf der steilen Dichterlaufbahn', 1885–8), a chronology of his life which led him over the whole globe, particularly through the Orient, where—on Java—he died in 1918, and the complete bibliography. The chapter on 'World-Festivity' furnishes a valuable introduction to the language of this 'master of color impressions' and at the same time a contribution to our knowledge of impressionistic poetry.

R. SAMUEL.

CAMBRIDGE.

SHORT NOTICES

The latest of the contributions of the librarian of the Fiske Collection at Cornell University is by no means his least valuable; for in *The Problem of Wineland* (*Islandica*, vol. xxv. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. 84 pp. 5s.) Dr Halldór Hermansson discusses in great detail the various problems connected with the Norse discovery of America. His account may be divided into four sections: 1. The Sources, in which he declares for the authenticity of *Eiríks rauðs saga*, and the untrustworthiness of the Tales of the Greenlanders. 2. The alleged Norse remains in America, all of which seem spurious to him. 3. An investigation of the geographical aspects of the question, in which he re-states a theory of his own about the situation of Wineland and Markland. 4. The effects of the discovery—which seem to have been very few.

It is very difficult to venture on criticism of such a closely-packed treatise as this, which contains items of interest about the descendants of the characters in the various stories of the discovery of Wineland, as well as the explorers themselves. One might point out, however, a few sins—of omission, as on p. 49, where a reference to Edward F. Gray's *Leif Eriksson*, Appendix A, might be added to Note 2; and of commission, as on p. 49, n. 5, where *Antiquity*, IV, should be *Antiquity*, VI; Aud gave Vifil 'a land' (=bústaðr, Vífilsdalr) on p. 8; while Thorhall is 'a quitter' (p. 30). But these are but tiny flaws in a most comprehensive, readable and scholarly work.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

In *Elizabethan Comic Character Conventions as revealed in the Comedies of George Chapman* by Paul V. Kreider (*University of Michigan Publications. Language and Literature*, vol. xvii. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1935. \$2.50) there may be some facts of interest to scholars. In general, however, it is a sifting and classifying of information familiar to serious students of the period. Chapter II on the technique of the identification and exposition of characters is lucidly and compactly expressed and is the most valuable section in the book. The chapter on psychological characterization is disappointing, for no attempt is made to link it up with the preceding sections. The analysis of the character of Quintiliano in *May Day*, though ingenious, seems to me to misinterpret Chapman's aims. The statement on p. 32 that the Elizabethan dramatists were 'either ignorant of the fact that disguise is seldom more than mildly convincing upon the stage or else disregarding it...' is a total misapprehension of this particular Elizabethan convention.

J. H. WALTER.

Mr W. B. C. Watkins in his *Johnson and English Poetry before 1660* (Princeton: University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1936. 120 pp. 8s.) has used all the available sources—including of course the usually neglected Dictionary—to discover the extent and quality of Dr Johnson's knowledge of O.E., M.E., sixteenth- and seventeenth-century poetry.

He has not only collected statistics (that would in itself have been valuable) but has employed his very competent mind in drawing conclusions. One of his most interesting discoveries is that Johnson's knowledge of lyric poetry and ballads is wider than one would have expected. The world has already been apprised of his intimacy with Donne's lyrics by the note supplied by Professor Nichol Smith (under whom Mr Watkins has been working) for Professor Garrod's lecture on Cowley. Mr Watkins' book is valuable as any good new book on Johnson must be. It is valuable also as a contribution to our understanding of the nature and extent of that quickening of English scholarship which was going on around him.

On p. 4 the remarks about Johnson and Thomas Warton do not take account of the relevant fact of their estrangement.

G. TILLOTSON.

The third edition of Mr Austin Lane Poole's *Poems of Gray and Collins* (London: Oxford University Press. 1937. 328 pp.) is the fruit of revision by Mr Leonard Whibley for Gray and Mr Frederick Page for Collins, and incorporates some results of a good deal of work upon these poets by Mr Whibley himself and other scholars since Gray and Collins first appeared in the invaluable Oxford series of English poets. It has, for example, the advantage of correction of notes in the light of the great collection of Gray's *Correspondence*, which has importance even in textual matters. The book is handsome and handy. I do not know that it was necessary to convey atmosphere to the extent of introducing uneven inking and damaged type into the first half-title.

C. J. SISSON.

Annals of English Literature (1475-1925), compiled by Dr J. C. Ghosh, assisted by Miss E. G. Withycombe (London: Oxford University Press. 1935. vi+340 pp. 8s. 6d.), will take its place at once along with other Oxford standard works of reference. Here are solved in one volume most of the maddening questions of comparative chronology whose answers must otherwise be sought in perhaps four or five histories of literature.

Originating from an aspiration of Sir Walter Raleigh for complete *Annals of English Literature*, this volume summarizes in 267 pages, year by year, the publication dates of all the books of major writers and of the more significant books of minor writers. The birth-date of the author appears in a bracket at each entry, so that his age at the publication of the work may easily be seen. The Index of Authors provides a complementary summary of all entries in the text, with occasional additions. No distinction is made between English, American, and Dominion authors, and it would be difficult to cavil at the catholicity of a selection which includes *Science and Health*, *The Loom of Youth*, *The King's English*, four of Noel Coward's plays, and *The Four Just Men*, while omitting, in the eighteenth century, at least two of Johnson's poets. The right-hand margin of each page in the chronological section gives authors' dates of birth and death, the reigning monarch and President of the United States, periodical publications, translations, and notable editions,

and a selection of public events beginning with Cortes and Magellan and ranging through the discovery of logarithms, the foundation of the first Sunday newspaper, and the Communist Manifesto, to Einstein and *John O'London's Weekly*. I have been able to detect only infinitesimal misprints.

W. W. MILLER.

In *Beaumarchais and his Opponents, New Documents on his Lawsuits* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1936. 278 pp.) Miss M. L. Johnson has re-examined the principal Beaumarchais controversies (Goëzman, Korneman, Chevalier d'Eon, Mirabeau, etc.) by paying more attention than has been given hitherto to the pamphlets of Beaumarchais' adversaries. These largely constitute the 'new documents' claimed, and there is certainly a wealth of them. Are no legal minutes or *procès-verbaux* extant? They would be a valuable corrective to the extravagances put forward by either side in such cases as the Goëzman scandal. There is no precise indication in Miss Johnson's bibliography as to whether she has had access to the Bibliothèque Nationale 'Pièces concernant l'affaire Goëzman' which Loménie quotes; it would be interesting to know what this dossier contains. The author's manner of presenting her thesis leaves much to be desired; the excessive use of subtitles and occasional repetitions of documents (e.g. pp. 170, 194) spoil the flow of the narrative; the English is bad, and misleading terminology such as 'the fall of the Maupeou Parliament' should have been avoided. There is, however, interesting material here which, manipulated in a less journalistic fashion, recast and presented as a literary and organic whole, would make of the book a much more welcome contribution to the history of eighteenth-century libellous literature.

H. J. HUNT.

There is a good deal of real significance in this issue of the *Deutsches Dante Jahrbuch* (18 Band; neue Folge Band 9. Weimar: Böhlau. 1936. 222 pp. R.M. 10.50). If the first article ('Dantes Purgatorio, Dantes persönlichsten Bekenntnis') by Dr Engelbert Krebs contains little that is new, although it is an able and, in places, a penetrating survey, in the essay 'Dantes Schuld', Freiherr v. Falkenhausen, in discussing once again the import of Beatrice's reproaches in *Purgatorio*, propounds additional reasons for adopting Barbi's view; the suggestion, however, that Beatrice is not only thinking of Dante's sins, but also of sin in general is not likely to meet with general approval. By contrasting the views on crime held by the Bolognese lawyer Alberto Gandino with those of Dante, Dr Richard Schmidt provides a new angle from which to check the originality of Dante's outlook: he was not concerned with a judicial determination of each infringement of human and divine law, but judged the sinners in accordance with his conception of a superior justice; or justice as it should be administered. The lawyer's and poet's views, if different, are also complementary to one another, and the author rightly holds that a close examination of Kantorowicz's work (*Albertus Gandinus*) would repay all serious students of Dante. Dr Gerhard Ledig clearly shows that, as was to be expected, Dante's concepts of time and eternity are traceable

to Aquinas; and Dr Theodore Absil, by well reasoned references to the works of the same philosopher, succeeds in determining more exactly than any other interpreter has done some passages of *Paradiso* concerning *Das Sein Gottes*. There follows Dr Herbert Grundmann's lecture 'Dante und Meister Eckhart', and Dr Ferdinand Koenen's 'Der Jagdhund und Hirte' in which it is somewhat daringly argued that the 'cinquecento dieci e cinque' is not to be identified with the Veltro, the former being suggested by John's 666, and the number 515 having as its principal factor 5, so that, according to mediæval values, it points to a man of action and virtue, and namely to an emperor, though not to any definite occupier of the imperial throne. Likewise the Veltro should be understood as 'a pope'. Far more convincing is Robert Davidsohn's welcome reply to the article by Professor Hampe in Bd. 17 of the same periodical. As had been suggested in my account of that issue, the attempt at reviving the old view concerning the date of *Monarchia* was ill-timed, and Davidsohn adds some cogent reasons in favour of the opinion that the treatise was composed during Henry's second approach to Rome, and not in the last years of Dante's life. At the end the editor prints an exhaustive and well reasoned survey of German books and articles concerning Dantean studies.

C. FOLIGNO.

Two papers of some importance accompany the 52nd, 53rd and 54th Annual Reports of the Dante Society (Cambridge, Mass.) (Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. 70 pp. 3s. 6d.). In the first (*Dante and Bonagiunta*) Professor Shaw carefully builds up a case against the usual interpretations of this episode as having a bearing upon the lyric school of *Stil Novo*, and expresses the opinion that this episode 'contains no elaborate doctrine of the poetic art', but it 'does contain the assertion of the superiority of poetry inspired by spiritual love, over other kinds'. The author's name renders any praise of the thoroughness of this paper superfluous: I scarcely expect, however, that his conclusions will meet with assent. A discussion of the various points raised would require much space; there are, however, two general remarks that militate against this attempt at emptying the famous episode of the significance which has been ascribed to it; Bonagiunta had corresponded with Guinizelli on the new school of poetry, and Guinizelli's reply was no less off-handish than Dante's; Guinizelli himself is met shortly afterwards, and Dante's concern with literary matters is nowhere more clearly apparent than in these cantos of *Purgatorio*.

In the second paper G. A. Borgese contributes a survey of Dante criticism; it is in parts of much interest, notably in his dissection of Croce's views and their condemnation. But Borgese's obvious anxiety to allow as large a share as possible to works of American critics causes him occasionally to stray from the main line of his argument. The negative section of his article is far more cogent than the positive one: he holds that æsthetic criticism of Dante has not prospered since De Sanctis, except in so far as Croce has succeeded in demonstrating by his example that it is of no further use. Historical criticism would appear to hold its own

in Signor Borgese's opinion; but it is to be regretted that, in dealing with a subject of some relevance, he has not attempted a more complete and exhaustive survey.

C. FOLIGNO.

Dante scholars are in a considerable debt to Professor McKenzie for suggesting, and Mr L. H. Gordon for producing, this supplement (*Supplementary Concordance to the Minor Italian Works of Dante* completed by Lewis H. Gordon with an introduction by Kenneth McKenzie. Published for the Dante Society (Cambridge, Mass.): Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xviii+38 pp. 8s. 6d.) to Sheldon's *Concordanza delle Opere Italiane*, etc. (Oxford 1905), for, since the appearance of Barbi's *Testo Critico* (Florence 1921), in which the order of Dante's *Rime* had been entirely altered, new poems introduced, and several condemned, it had become difficult to use the *Concordanza* despite Toynbee's ingenious attempt at following the *Testo Critico* without disturbing the order of the *Oxford Dante*. The introduction clearly explains the method adopted; its inspiring motive may be found in Professor McKenzie's *Observations on Dante's Lyrical Poems*, 49th-51st Annual Reports of the Dante Society (Cambridge, Mass.) 1934. No library, and no Dante student can well do without this *Supplement*.

C. FOLIGNO.

Don Luis Carrillo de Sotomayor has had the misfortune to be classed as a precursor, and so read not for his own contribution to poetry but for his possible influence on Góngora. D. Dámaso Alonso's edition of the *Poetas Completas* (Madrid: Signo. 1936. 184 pp. 3 ptas. 50) should put an end to this unjust treatment of an authentic poet; one who 'hubiera sido uno de los mayores de nuestra lengua'. When he died at the age of twenty-seven Carrillo had not yet forged his style, and his poems are sometimes in the fluid manner of Lope, tipped with *agudezas*, sometimes complex and hinting at Góngora, sometimes gravely sententious like Quevedo. Lack of revision accounts for some real obscurities in the text; the rhythms are not infrequently harsh and there is much jingle. But with these are coupled many admirable qualities: 'ternura, suavidad, agudeza, traviesa donosura, fuerza, gravedad sentenciosa, pompa, clásica elegancia, pasión, arrebató'. The influence of Horace (*Odes*, 1, 1, 3, 5, 9, etc.), Ovid, Vergil (*Eclogue* VIII) appears in discrete reminiscences or open translation; among the moderns, Garcilaso. The editor suspects that his heart was not deeply engaged in his love poems. It is a pleasure to read those which are inspired by his nautical profession (Carrillo was a rear-admiral), such as the vivid and swift-moving *Caza de unas galeotas turquescas*. The text is that of 1613, which Sr Alonso considers less bad than that of 1611. Even so, important rearrangements have had to be made. The second edition is generally considered superior to the first, but in the *Libro de Erudición Poética* (of which an edition is being prepared by Mrs Spender) some of the improvements seem to have been attained by making the poet's prose more conventional. A critical edition of this great poet is desirable, so as to allow scholars the means of forming their own judgment; e.g., as to the authenticity of the 1611 poems not included in 1613.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

A notice of the first part of Professor Walter Gottschalk's *Die Bildhaften Sprichwörter der Romanen* appeared in this *Review* in January 1937, pp. 144-5. The second volume is entitled *Der Mensch im Sprichwort der romanischen Völker* (Heidelberg: Winter. 1936. viii+356 pp. 9 M. 80). In a brief preface the author refers to criticism of the first volume, justifying his classification by metaphor rather than sense, and his use of proverbs in the literary language only, ignoring sporadic proverbs which may appear in the dialects. Fourteen pages in very small type contain additions to the first volume, and to the second volume itself there are four pages of extra matter. The chapters are devoted to Man and his Body, Food, Clothes, Houses, Utensils, and Trades. The book is a *catalogue raisonné*, with an occasional note to explain a debatable interpretation. Apart from the difficulty of classification by sense, it is probable that most proverbs are memorable for some striking word or metaphor. The author's method is thus as good a clue as any through the unsightly masses of print.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

A new critical edition of the *Trutznachtigall* has appeared which supplants all previous editions and reprints, being founded on a scientific investigation of the existing MSS., *Trutznachtigall von Friedrich Spee*. Mit Einleitung und kritischem Apparat herausgegeben von Gustave Otto Arlt. (*Braunes Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts*, 292-301. Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. clxxxi+344 pp. 9 M.) The relationship between the two autograph MSS. of Strassburg and Trier, the Paris MS. copy and the first printed edition of 1649 is carefully investigated and the interesting conclusion reached that the Kölner Druck goes back to a lost autograph MS., which accounts for its forming the basis of the present edition.

The introduction comprises only about 20 pages, and yet the editor contrives to condense into this space the results of his research into the sources, and some enlightening tables to support his conclusions. He has gone to the trouble of comparing the three major MSS. and the first print on a mathematical basis, and gives a table of the deviations which are to be found in each poem. There is no biography of Spee, as this side of the work has already been done by Balke and others.

A useful feature is a chronological list of all previous editions of Spee's works. As has been mentioned, the text follows in the version of the early print; at the end of the book, however, there is to be found a complete list of deviations clearly grouped under pages of the present edition and the relevant MSS. The title-pages and Spee's 'Merckpunctlein' are also given in the divergent forms from the three main MSS. The comparisons between the readings of the various MSS. show the pains Spee took with his verses to achieve the ideal word order.

This most scholarly edition will be a welcome addition to any library.

H. S. M. AMBURGER-STUART.

German literature gains by being placed against its European background, as it is in the present work, *Histoire de la Littérature Allemande*, by Geneviève Bianquis. (Paris: Collection Armand Colin. No. 195.

1936. 216 pp. 10.50 fr.). In the mediæval period Germany is shown awakening under the stimulus of the Crusades and French chivalrous culture to a literary productiveness which culminated in the splendid outburst of Minnesang and Court Epic. What Luther meant for his age is finely appreciated with the utmost economy of expression. Recent research has been fully drawn upon for the treatment of the seventeenth century and the wider implications of the Gottsched-Bodmer literary controversy are interestingly brought out. A subtle analysis of the criss-cross tendencies of the earlier eighteenth century shows the foundations being laid for the age of Goethe. The great poets of that age are approached with a knowledge and understanding free from the usual shibboleths. In so condensed a study one is astonished to find that there has been room to note the Saint Simonianism of Goethe's *Wanderjahre* and the Hegelianism in the Second Part of *Faust*. But the major part of the book is devoted to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries down to the end of the Republic in 1933. With the utmost concision drama, lyric, novel receive their due; the more important authors are sensitively characterized, the minor writers skilfully grouped. The whole is as fresh as it is scholarly. It is the best short history of German literature that has yet appeared.

I. M. MASSEY.

We have pleasure in recording the appearance of a new journal in the field of German studies, *German Life and Letters* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Quarterly, 4s. 6d.). It was launched under the auspices of the Conference of University Teachers of German in Great Britain and Ireland, and is fortunate in having in Professor L. A. Willoughby an editor admirably qualified to achieve its aim of dealing, in a way which should appeal not only to the scholar but also to the educated general public, with German culture in its widest aspect: its history, literature, religion, music, art.

The first number appeared in October 1936, and contained, apart from a Preface and a Chronicle by the Editor, articles by G. P. Gooch on *German Foreign Policy since the War*, by Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer on *The Art of the German Novel*, by L. A. Willoughby on *Austrian Nationality and Austrian Literature*, by F. B. Aikin-Sneath on *The Press in Modern Germany*, by W. D. Robson-Scott on *The Berlin Stage 1935-6*, and translations by Gertrude Craig-Houston from the *Stundenbuch* of Rainer Maria Rilke. Of the second number, which has since appeared, it may safely be said that it at least maintains the high standard set by its predecessor. In the *Notes on New Books* (Historical by G. P. Gooch, Literary by A. Gillies) it adds a new and acceptable feature.

The *Modern Language Review* greets this younger sister, who so well supplements her own work, and wishes her long life and prosperity.

H. G. ATKINS.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

January—March 1937

With the collaboration of MARY S. SERJEANTSON (English),
A. T. HATTO and F. NORMAN (German)

GENERAL

- ADRIEN, A., *L'Articulation des Voyelles*. Paris, Vrin. 12 fr.
- BALLY, C., ELISE RICHTER, A. ALONSO, R. LIDA, *El impresionismo en el Language* (Estudios Estilísticos, II). Buenos Aires, Instituto de Filología (Universidad).
- BAUMGARTEN, A., *Wissenschaft und Sprache*. Rektoratsprogram. Basel, Reinhardt.
- BERTONI, G., *Lingua e Poesia*. Florence, Olschki. L. 30.
- BINKLEY, R. C., *Realism and Nationalism, 1852-71*. New York, Harpers. 15s.
- BORCHERT, H. H., *Das europäische Theater im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance*. Leipzig, Weber. 11 M. 50.
- CARNAP, R., *The logical Syntax of Language* (International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method). 25s.
- CORNISH, V., *Borderlands of Language in Europe and their relation to the historic frontier of Christendom*. London, Sifton Praed. 6s.
- CROCE, B., *Recenti Controversie intorno all' Unità della Storia d' Italia* (British Academy). Oxford University Press. 1s.
- Enciclopedia Italiana*, XXXI: SCAR-SOC. Rome, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana.
- GLUNZ, H. H., *Die Literaturästhetik des europäischen Mittelalters: Wolfram, Rosenroman, Chaucer, Dante* (Das Abendland, 2). Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus. 20 M.
- HAMMER, LORE, *Das Wählen in Freiheit als Mittel zur Konfliktverschärfung im modernen Drama*. Würzburg, Triltsch.
- HERDAN, J., *Dictionnaire technique en 4 langues: anglais-polonais-français-allemand*. Paris, Beranger. 75 fr.
- HONNORAT, M., *La Tour de Babel et la langue primitive de la Terre*. Paris, Maisonneuve. 40 fr.
- Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης, I: A-Αμ (Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν). £3. 10s. 0d.
- MEILLET, A., *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, II. Paris, Klincksieck. 60 fr.
- MEOZZI, A., *Il Secentismo europeo: marinismo, gongorismo, preziosismo, lilismo*, Schwulst. Pisa, Nistri-Lischi. L. 12.
- Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Phonetic Science (1935)*, ed. D. Jones and D. B. Fry. Cambridge Univ. Press. 20s.
- RÉBORA, P., *Civiltà italiana e civiltà inglese*. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 16.
- SOTAVALLA, A., *Die Phonetik und ihre Beziehungen zu den Grenzwissenschaften* (Annales Acad. scient. Fennicae, 31, 3). Helsinki, Tiedekatemia. Fmk. 50.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- GAMILLSCHEG, E., *Zum romanischen Artikel und Possessivpronomen* (Szb. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl. 1936, 2). Berlin, De Gruyter. 2 M.
- KLEIN, H. W., *Die volkstümlichen sprichwörtlichen Vergleiche im lateinischen und in den romanischen Sprachen*. Diss. Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M. 60.

Mediaeval Latin.

- BELLI, P., *De Re Militari et Bello tractatus*, I, II, ed. trsl. H. C. Nutting. Oxford Univ. Press. 30s.
- CASSIODORUS, *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors. Oxford Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- DU CANGE, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, editio nova, I. Paris, Prima. 120 fr.
- GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, *Autobiography*, ed. trsl. H. E. Butler. London, Cape. 15s.
- GUIDO DE COLUMNIS, *Historia destructionis Troiae*, ed. N. E. Griffin. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America. \$4.
- JOSZ, A., *Severino Boezio nel dramma della Romanità*. Milan, Treves. L. 12.
- KALLEN, G., *Nikolaus von Cues als politischer Erzieher (Wissenschaft und Zeitgeist)*. 1 M. 50.
- MÉRICOURT, M. J. DE, *Gesta Dei per Francos (Nostradamus)*. Paris, Les Œuvres Françaises. 10 fr.
- PARRY, J. J., *Brut y Brenhinedd, Cotton Cleopatra version*. Cambridge, Mass., Mediaeval Academy of America. \$6.
- SALVATORELLI, L., *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana dalle origini alla metà del VI secolo*. Milan, Vallardi. L. 40.
- VAN DEN WYNGAERT, A., *Simica Franciscana*, I: *Itinera et relationes fratrum minorum saeculi XIII et XIV*, II: *Relationes et epistolae saeculi XVI et XVII*, III: *Relationes et epistolae saeculi XVII*. Paris, Geuthner. 450 fr.
- WINTERSWYL, L. A., *Albert der Deutsche, das Leben und Werken des Albertus Magnus*. 2 M. 62.
- ZITELLO, F., *Il canto di Andria di Anfuso sull' eruzione dell' Etna del 1408*. Palermo, Boccone del Povero. L. 15.

Italian.

- ALFIERI, Saul, ed. M. Lombardi Lotti (*Classici Italiani*). Turin, Paravia. L. 4.
- ANAGNINE, E. G., *Pico della Mirandola (Bibl. di Cultura Moderna)*. Bari, Laterza. L. 18.
- BASILEA, S., *L' Opera di Giacinto Gallina nel teatro italiano*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 12.
- BIANCHI, L., *Dante und Stefan George*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 6.
- BINNI, V., *La poetica del decadentismo italiano*. Florence, Sansoni. L. 20.
- BOIARDO, *Tutte le opere*, I: *Amorum libri, Pastoralis, Orlando innamorato*, ed. A. Zottoli (*Classici*). Milan, Mondadori. L. 45.
- BONOMI, I., *Mazzini triumviro della Repubblica romana*. Turin, Einaudi. L. 10.
- BURCKHARDT, J., *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy (Phaidon Press Art Books: English Edition)*. 7s. 6d.
- CAFARO, G., *Francesco Morelli*. Lucca, presso l' Autore. L. 2.
- CAFARO, G., *Parliamo di F. T. Marinetti*. Urbana, Bramante. L. 2.50.
- CAGGESE, R., *Grande Storia d' Italia*, III: *L' alto Medioevo*. Turin, UTET. L. 85.
- CAMPANELLA, T., *Teologia*, I. Milan, Vita e Pensiero. L. 40.
- CARDUCCI, G., *L' Ariosto e il Tasso, Lirica e Storia nei secoli XVII e XVIII (Ediz. Naz. xiv, xv)*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 40.
- CIAN, V., *Vicenzo Gioberti e l' on. Abate G. U. Monti, Lettere inedite*. Rome, Ist. per la Storia del Risorgimento. L. 10.
- CIONE, E., *L' Amore per Napoli nei romantici (1830-48)*. Naples, Detken e Rocholl. L. 10.

- CORSANO, A., *Il Pensiero religioso italiano, dall' Umanesimo al Giurisdizionalismo* (Bibl. di Cultura Moderna). Bari, Laterza. 3s.
- COZZANI, E., Pascoli, I. Milan, L' Eroica. L. 10.
- DANTE, *La Vita Nuova*, ed. D. Mattalia (Classici Italiani). Turin, Paravia. L. 4.50.
- DELL' ISOLA, M., Carducci nella letteratura europea. 60 fr.
- DONATI, B., *Nuovi Studi sulla filosofia civile di G. B. Vico*. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 50.
- GALILEI, G., *Opere*, I, ed. S. Timpanaro. Milan, Rizzoli. L. 40.
- GERVASONI, G., *L' Ambiente letterario milanese nel secondo decennio dell' Ottocento, Angelo Mai alla Biblioteca Ambrosiana (Fontes Ambrosiani)*. Florence, Olschki. L. 40.
- GHISI, F., *Canti Carnascialeschi nelle fonti musicali del xv e xvi secolo*. Florence, Olschki. L. 40.
- GRILLI, A., *Elogi e discorsi*. Rome, Scie. L. 9.
- IMBRIANI, V., *Critica d' arte e prose narrative*, ed. G. Doria (Bibl. di Cultura Moderna). Bari, Laterza. L. 18.
- LEOPARDI, *Canti*, sel. ed. V. M. Jeffery. Cambridge Univ. Press. 5s.
- LEOPARDI, *Opere, Saggi Giovanili, Carte Napoletane*, ed. R. Bacchelli e G. Scarpa. Milan, Off. Tip. Gregoriana. L. 60.
- LOHNER, H., *Deutschlands Anteil an der italienischen Romantik* (Spr. u. Dichtung, 62). Bern, Haupt. 3 M. 60.
- MAROU, V., *Machiavelli*. Amsterdam, Allert de Lange. Fl. 4.50.
- MARINETTI, F. T., *L' Originalità napoletana del poeta Salvatore di Giacomo*. Naples, Casella. L. 12.
- MORANDO, F. E., *Studi di letteratura e di storia*, pref. G. Ansaldo. Florence, La Nuova Italia. L. 10.
- NATOLI, G., et A. RICKLIN, *Poètes italiens contemporains* (Fac. des Lettres, Strasbourg). Paris, Belles Lettres. 15 fr.
- OLIVERO, F., *La Rappresentazione dell' immagine in Dante*. Turin, Lattes. L. 12.
- PANCRAZI, P., *Scrittori italiani, dal Carducci al D' Annunzio* (Bibl. di Cultura Moderna). Bari, Laterza. L. 16.
- PARENTI, M., *Bibliografia Manzoniiana*, I. Florence, Sansoni. L. 50.
- PARINI, G., *Dal 'Giorno' e dalle 'Odi'*, ed F. Rizzi (Classici Italiani). Turin, Paravia. L. 6.50.
- PASCOLI, G., *Poesie varie* (Tutte le Opere, VII). Milan, Mondadori. L. 15.
- PELLICO, S., *Le mie Prigioni*, ed. R. Morozzo della Rocca. Turin, Paravia. L. 8.
- PETRARCA-HAUS, *Tätigkeitsbericht, 1931-36*. Cologne, Petrarca-Haus.
- RENDI, U., *Folengo*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- RUSSO, L., *Ritratti e disegni storici, da Machiavelli a Carducci* (Bibl. di Cultura Moderna). Bari, Laterza. L. 30.
- SACHETTI, F., *Il Libro delle Rime*, ed. A. Chiari. Bari, Laterza. L. 50.
- SACRET, J. H., *The DXV Problem and the Veltro*. Reading, Bradley. 1s.
- SALA, G., *Scrittori cattolici italiani del '900*. Lanciano, Carabba. L. 5.
- SCHNEIDER, F., *Der deutsche Weg zu Dante*. Weimar, Böhlau. 1 M. 35.
- SCHUCHHARD, H., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der italienischen Scheidewörter* (Berliner Beitr., VI, 3). Jena, Gronau. 6 M. 80.
- SCODRO, R., *Anime in tormento* (Oriani, Nietzsche, Leopardi, Savonarola). Padua, Zannoni. L. 6.
- SCODRO, R., *Maestri d' arte e di vita* (Mazzini, Nievo, Mameli, Bourget, Bazin, Oriani). Padua, Zannoni. L. 8.

- Scrittori della Svizzera italiana, 2 vols. Bellinzona, 1st Edit. Ticinese.
 Storia d' Italia illustrata, I: alla morte di Cesare. 22s. 6d.
 TRABALZA, C., La Critica letteraria del Rinascimento (Storia dei Generi Letterari Italiani). 8s. 6d.
 VALGIMIGLI, M., Francesco De Sanctis. Padua, CEDAM. L. 5.
 VICO, G. B., Il Diritto universale, ed. F. Nicolini (Scrittori d' Italia). Bari, Laterza. L. 100.
 WARTBURG, W. VON, La Posizione della lingua italiana nel mondo neolatino (Bibl. Herziana in Rom). Leipzig, Keller. 0 M. 80.
 WEICKERT, MARIANNE, Die literarische Form von Machiavellis 'Principe'. Wurzburg, Triltsch. 3 M. 60.
 ZIBORDI, G., Carducci come io lo vidi. Milan, Bietti. L. 10.
 ZINI, Z., Gioberti. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- Art de la Catalogne de la 2^e moitié du ix^e siècle à la fin du xv^e siècle. Paris, Cahiers d'Art; London, Heinemann. 125 fr.
 BAER, F., Die Juden im christlichen Spanien. Berlin, Schocken. M. 20.
 Baroque américain (num. spéc. de 'La Renaissance'). Paris, La Renaissance. 20 fr.
 BOSCH GIMPERA, P., Etnología de la Península Ibérica. Barcelona, Alpha.
 EDEL, R., Vicente Blasco Ibáñez in seinem Verhältnis zu einigen neueren französischen Romanschriftstellern (Zola, Flaubert, Huysmans, J. und E. de Goncourt, Rodenbach). Diss. Gütersloh, Thiele.
 GIACALONE, B., Americana (Communismo incaico. Araucania. Florida. Colombiana). Genoa, Bozzi. L. 15.
 GUAMAN POMA DE AYALA, F., Nueva coronica y buen gobierno. Paris, Inst. d'Ethnologie. 250 fr.
 GUERRIERI CROCETTI, C., Juan de la Cueva e le origini del teatro nazionale spagnolo. Turin, Gambino. L. 15.
 HAHN, E., Spanisch (Lautbibliothek, Nr. 95). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 0 M. 90.
 HANKE, L., Handbook of Latin American Studies. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s. 6d.
 HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA, P., La Cultura y las Letras coloniales en Santo Domingo (Bibl. de Dialectología Hispanoamericana). Buenos Aires, Instituto de Filología (Universidad).
 KRETSCHMANN, W., Die Kausalsätze und Kausalkonjunktionen in der altspanischen Literatursprache. Diss. Hamburg, Schimkus.
 LARRASQUET, J., Le Basque souletin nord-oriental, I. Paris, Larrasquet (50 rue Saint-Placide). 50 fr.
 MCCLELLAND, IVY, The Origins of the Romantic Movement in Spain. Liverpool, Institute of Hispanic Studies. 18s.
 MÉRIMÉE, P., L'Influence française en Espagne au dix-huitième siècle. Paris, Belles Lettres. 9 fr.
 MEZAN, S., De Gabirol à Abravanel, juifs espagnols promoteurs de la Renaissance. Paris, Lipschutz. 25 fr.
 ROS, F. DE, Le Père François d'Osuna. Paris, Beauchesne. 70 fr.
 ROTH, C., The Spanish Inquisition. 12s. 6d.
 RUBÍO I LLUCH, A., Homenatge a Antoni Rubió i Lluch. 3 vols. Barcelona.
 THOMAZI, A., Les Flottes de l'Or: histoire des galions d'Espagne. Paris, Payot. 20 fr.
 YEPES, J. M., Le Panaméricanisme. Paris, Éd. Internationales. 30 fr.

Portuguese.

Reden und Abhandlungen zur Eröffnung des Instituts für Portugal und Brasilien der Universität Berlin (Schriftenreihe des Inst. f. Portugal, 1). Berlin, Metzner. 1 M. 80.

SANCEAU, ELAINE, *Indies Adventure: the amazing career of Afonso de Albuquerque*. London, Blackie. 12s. 6d.

SINGER, A., *Die Werkzeugbezeichnungen im Portugiesischen*. Diss. Berlin, Triltsch und Huther.

Rumanian, Rhaetoromance.

FLEURE, H. J., and R. A. PELHAM (ed.), *Eastern Carpathian Studies: Roumania*. London, Le Play Society. 2s. 6d.

LANSEL, P., *The Raeto-Romans*, transl. Elizabeth Maxfield. Chur, Bischofberger.

French, Provençal.*(a) General, including Linguistic.*

BALLY, C., *Traité de stylistique française*, II (Indogerm. Bibl.). Heidelberg, Winter. 5 M.

BRUNOT, F., *Histoire de la langue française*, IX: *La Révolution et l'Empire*; II: *Les événements, les institutions et la langue*. Paris, Colin. 110 fr.

CHOLEAU, J., et MARIE DROUARET, *Chansons et danses populaires de Haute Bretagne*. Vitry (L.-et-V.). 35 fr.

Dialectes Suisses, Patois de la Suisse romande: Canton du Valais (Lautbibliothek, Nr. 68). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 0 M. 80.

DUBBERKE, IRMGARD, *Die Sprache des 'Livre Noir' und der 'Établissements' von Dax* (Berliner Beiträge, VI, 4). Jena, Gronau. 5 M. 80.

GODEFROY, F., *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, new ed. facs., I. Paris, Prima. 160 fr.

HARTWIG, DORA, *Der Wortschatz der Plastik im französischen Mittelalter*. Diss. Würzburg, Mayr.

Histoire littéraire de la France, XXXVII, 1. Paris, Klincksieck. 100 fr.

IMBERT, N., *Dictionnaire national des Contemporains*. Paris, Lajeunesse. 300 fr.

LEFRANC, *Mélanges offerts à M. Abel Lefranc*. Paris. 100 fr.

MORNET, D., *A Short History of French Literature*, transl. C. A. Choquette and C. Gauss. New York, London, Philip Allan. 6s.

MÜLLER, H., *Das schmückende Beiwort im französischen Volkslied*. Diss. Halle, John.

MITCHELL, R. L. G., *France: a companion to French studies*. London, Methuen. 16s.

SNYCKERS, A., *Duden Français. Dictionnaire ill. de la langue française*. Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. 6 M.

STROBEL, H., *Die von Pflanzennamen abgeleiteten Ortsnamen einiger süd-französischen Departements*. Diss. Tübingen, Göbel.

TOBLER, A. LOMMATSCH, *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, I: A-B, II: C-D. Berlin, Weidmann.

UNGERN-STERBERG, R. VON, *Frankreich: Lebensraum und Wesen*. Berlin, Stilke. 4 M. 50.

(b) Old French.

Art et instruction de bien dancier (1488), facs. ed. V. Scholderer. London, Royal College of Physicians.

Âtre périlleux, L', ed. B. Woledge (Class. fr. du M.A.). 24 fr.

- BECKER, P. A., Fauvel und Fauvelliana (Berichte über d. Verh. d. Sachs. Ak. v. Wiss., Phil.-Hist. Kl. 88). Leipzig, Hirzel. 1 M. 70.
- BECKER, P. A., Von den Erzählern neben und nach Chrestien de Troyes. Halle, Niemeyer.
- BIELING, A., Das deutsche Rolandslied im Spiegel des französischen Rolandsliedes. Diss. Düsseldorf, Nolte.
- BRERETON, G. E., Des Grantz Geanz: an Anglo-Norman poem (Medium Aevum Monographs, 1). Oxford, Blackwell. 10s. 6d.
- BRETTSCHNEIDER, H., Der Anseis de Carthage und die Seconda Spagna (Romanist. Arb. 17). Halle, Niemeyer. 9 M.
- CARMAN, J. N., The Relationship of the Perlesvaus and the Queste del Saint Graal (Univ. of Kansas, Humanistic Studies, v, 4). \$1.00.
- CHIRI, G., L' Epica latina medioevale e la Chanson de Roland. 5s. 6d.
- COVILLE, A., Le Traité de la Ruine de l'Église de Nicolas de Clamanges et la traduction française de 1564. Paris. 40 fr.
- DÜBI, H., Das Buch von den drei Betrugern und das Berner Manuskript (Neujahrsbl. d. Literar. Ges. Bern, N.F. 14). 4 M. 40.
- GRÖBER, G., Mittelfranzösische Literatur: Vers und Prosadichtung des 15. Jhs. (Grundriss d. rom. Phil.). Berlin, De Gruyter. 1936.
- HERBERT LE DUC DE DANMARTIN, Folque de Candie, ed. O. Schultz-Gora (Ges. f. roman. Literatur, 24, 1936), III. Halle, Niemeyer. 36 M.
- HOFFMANN, KÄTE, Themen der französischen Lyrik im 12. und 13. Jh. Diss. Freiburg, Kehr.
- ROHL, G., Die idyllisch-ländlichen Motive in der altfranzösischen Literatur. Diss. Rostock, Neumann.

(c) *Modern French.*

- ANDRÉ-VINCENT, P., Les Idées politiques de Chateaubriand. Paris, Sirey. 8 fr.
- ARBELLOT, S., Charles Maurras. Paris, Denoël et Steele. 6 fr.
- BAILLY, A., La Fontaine. Paris, Fayard. 16 fr. 50.
- BALZAC, Le Médecin de Campagne (Génie de la France). Paris, NRF. 5 fr.
- BALZAC, H. DE, Œuvres, ed. M. Allem, I, II, III. Paris, Garnier. 27 fr.
- BARBEY D'AUREVILLE, Les Diaboliques (Coll. Baldi). Paris, Rombaldi. 40 fr.
- BEGUIN, A., Gérard de Nerval. Paris, Stock. 10 fr.
- BENDZ, E., Paul Valéry et l'art de la prose. Göteborg, Guimbert. 15 fr.
- BENJAMIN, R., La Prodigieuse Vie d'Honoré de Balzac (Coll. Nelson). London, Nelson. 8 fr. 50.
- BISHOP, M., Pascal: the life of Genius. London, Bell. 12s. 6d.
- BLESSEBOIS, P. C., La Corneille de Mlle de Scay (1678), ed. F. Lachèvre. Paris, Clavreuil. 20 fr.
- BLOY, L., Lettres à Philippe Raoux. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer. 15 fr.
- BRÉMOND, H., Autour de l'humanisme: d'Érasme à Pascal. 16 fr. 50.
- BRON, L., Huysmans. Paris, Alsatia. 13 fr. 50.
- CHARLIER, G., Aspects de Lamartine. Paris, Albert. 12 fr.
- CHARPENTIER, J., Baudelaire, ou le drame du génie. Paris, Tallandier. 15 fr.
- DIDEROT, Lettre sur le Commerce de la Librairie. Paris, Grasset. 20 fr.
- DILLER, G. E., Les Dames des Roches: étude sur la vie littéraire à Poitiers dans la 2^e moitié du XVI^e siècle. Paris. 24 fr.
- DRÉANO, M., La Pensée religieuse de Montaigne. Paris, Beauchesne. 55 fr.
- DUMESNIL, R., Histoire de la Littérature française, IX: Le Réalisme. Paris, Gigord. 60 fr.

- EBELING, J. B., *Louis XIV, II: L'histoire racontée par ses témoins*. Paris, Plon. 25 fr.
- FISCHER, HILDEGARDE, *Antoine Furetière (1619-88) (Roman. Stud., 41)*. Berlin, Ebering. 16 M.
- FLAUBERT, *La Tentation de Saint Antoine (Classiques Garnier)*. Paris, Garnier. 9 fr.
- FLAUBERT, *Salammbô*, ed. R. Tisserand. Paris, Larousse. 7 fr. 50.
- FLAUBERT, *Trois Contes*. Paris, Hachette. 18 fr.
- FLOTES, P., *Le Drame intérieur de Pierre Loti*. Paris, Courrier Politique. 15 fr.
- FOERSTER, ILSE, *Marin Cureau de la Chambre (1594-1675) (Spr. u. Kultur d. germ. u. rom. Völker, C. 15)*. Diss. Breslau, Priebatsch. M. 10.
- FRIEDMAN, L. M., *Zola and the Dreyfus case*. Boston, Bacon Press. \$2.
- FROMENTIN, E., *Dominique*. Paris, Garnier. 9 fr.
- FUSIL, C. A., *Sylvain Maréchal*. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- GELOBTER, H., 'Le Spectateur' von Pierre Marivaux und die englischen moralischen Wochenschriften. Diss. Limburg, Limburger Vereinsdr.
- GIDE, A., *Œuvres complètes, XII*. Paris, NRF. 75 fr.
- GRAF, IRMINGARD, *Die Anfänge der französisch-kanadischen Dichtung*. Diss. Augsburg-Lechhausen, Hofmann.
- GUERRA, M., *Fine del caso Claudel*. Milan, Sperling e Kupfer. L. 12.
- HAAG, HILTRUD, *Der Gestaltwandel der Kupplerin in der französischen Literatur des 16. und 17. Jhs*. Diss. Marburg, Ebel.
- HAEDICKE, W., *Étienne-Pivert de Sénancour*. Diss. Bottrop, Postberg.
- HAWKINS, R. L., *Auguste Comte and the United States*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 8s. 6d.
- HEILMANN, ELEONORE, *Charles Pinot Duclos*. Diss. Würzburg, Triltsch.
- HÜBENER, ERIKA, *Der höfische Roman des französischen Rokoko*. Diss. Greifswald, Adler.
- JOUYE, P. L., *Matière Céleste*. Paris, NRF. 21 fr.
- KAISER, PAULA, *Lamartine und die Musik*. Diss. Munich, Mössl.
- KRAKOWSKI, E., *Deux poètes de l'héroïsme: Charles Péguy et Stanislas Wyspiański*. Paris, Attinger. 10 fr.
- LA FONTAINE, *Fables, 2 vols.* Paris, Piazza. 200 fr.
- LEROY, G., *L'Expérience de l'effort et de la grâce chez Maine de Biran*. Paris, Boivin. 50 fr.
- LEROY, G., *La Psychologie de Condillac*. Paris, Boivin. 30 fr.
- LESCOFFIER, J., *Björnson et la France*. Paris, Belles Lettres. 20 fr.
- LEVAILLANT, M., *Chateaubriand, Mme Récamier et les Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe d'après des documents inédits*. Paris.
- LÉVY-BRUHL, *Morceaux choisis*. Paris, NRF. 18 fr.
- LOISY, A., *George Tyrrell et Henry Brémond*. Paris, Nourry. 10 fr.
- MAINE DE BIRAN, *Œuvres, X*, ed. P. Tisserand. Paris. 70 fr.
- MARANINI, L., *Morte e commedia di Don Juan (intorno a una commedia di Molière)*. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 10.
- MARGENBURG, EDITH, *Charles Péguy (Roman. Stud., 42)*. Berlin, Ebering. 3 M. 60.
- MARNI, A., *Allegory in the French heroic poem of the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.
- MARTIN DU GARD, M., *Harmonies critiques*. Paris. 15 fr.
- MARVIN, F. S., *Comte*. London, Chapman and Hall. 6s.
- MAURIAC, F., *Journal, II*. Paris, Grasset. 35 fr.

- MÉLÈSE, P., Un Homme de lettres au temps du grand roi: Donneau de Visé, fondateur du Mercure Galant. Paris, Droz. 20 fr.
- MICHEL, MAGDA, Der Stil Chateaubriands (Arb. z. rom. Phil., 41). Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus. 3 M.
- NAUMANN, W., Die Sprachgebrauch Mallarmé's. Diss. Marburg, Bauer.
- PETER, R., La Vie Secrète de l'Académie française, 3me période. Paris, Lib. des Champs-Élysées. 13 fr. 50.
- RABELAIS, Gargantua, ed. L. Perceau. Paris, ed. du Manoir. 60 fr.
- RACINE, Œuvres, ed. P. Mesnard (Les Grands Écrivains de la France). Paris. 75 fr.
- RAGEOT, G., Madame du Deffand. Paris, Michel. 10 fr.
- RINGELMANN, A., Henri Pourrat (geb. 1887). Diss. Würzburg, Kilian.
- ROLLAND, H., Bibliographie d'Émile Espérandieu. Paris, Belles Lettres. 20 fr.
- RONSDARD, Les Amours (Coll. Baldi). Paris, Rombaldi. 35 fr.
- SACHER, H., Die Melodramatik und das romantische Drama in Frankreich. Diss. Borna-Leipzig, Noske.
- SAINÉAN, C. Lettres. Paris, Geuthner. 5 fr.
- SAINT-GERMÈS, M., Balzac considéré comme historien du droit. Paris, Nizet et Bastard. 50 fr.
- SAMSAM, N. D., L'Iran dans la littérature française. Paris, Presses Universitaires. 25 fr.
- SCHMID, G. O., Marmontel, seine moralischen Erzählungen und die deutsche Literatur. Diss. Strassburg, Heitz.
- SCHWESINGER, MARGRET, Die literarischen und buchhändlerischen Erfolge des naturalistischen Romans des 19. Jhs. im franz. Publikum. Diss. Munich.
- SERVAIS, T. H., Gustave Flauberts Urteile über die französische Literatur in seiner 'Correspondance'. Diss. Münster, Westfal. Vereinsdr.
- TAYLOR, F. A., The Theatre of Alexandre Dumas fils. Oxford Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- TIEDTKE, IRMA, Symbole und Bilder im Werke Marcel Prousts. Diss. Hamburg, Evert.
- TREVES, P., Joseph de Maistre. Rome, Dante Alighieri. L. 7.50.
- VAUGELAS, Commentaires sur les Remarques de Vaugelas par La Mothe le Vayer, etc., ed. J. Streicher, II. 60 fr.
- VIGNY, Cinq-Mars (Classiques Garnier). Paris, Garnier. 9 fr.
- VIGNY, Poésies Complètes (Bibl. de Cluny). Paris. 10 fr.
- VOLTAIRE, Candide, L'Ingénue, L'Homme aux 40 écus (Bibl. de Cluny). Paris. 10 fr.
- WEIRICH, R., Schillers Auffassung von der Kunst als einer erziehenden Macht und ihre Bedeutung für die französische Literatur des 19. und 20. Jhs. Diss. Würzburg, Mayr.
- WICKE, BERTA, Stilprobleme bei Stendhal. Diss. Lucerne, Wicke.
- WITTRICK, W., Der Gottesbegriff im Werke André Gides. Diss. Marburg, Bauer.
- (d) *Provençal*.
- BRUCK, E., Crousillat, ein Troubadour des 19. Jhs. Diss. Berlin, Triltsch und Huther.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- PFEILSTÜCKER, S., Spätantikes und germanisches Kunstgut in der frühangel-sachsischen Kunst nach lateinischen und altenglischen Schriftquellen (Kunstwissenschaftliche St., XIX). Berlin, Deutscher Kunstverlag. 17 M. 50.

Scandinavian.

HOLTSMARK, A., *En Islandsk Scholasticus fra det 12. Århundre*. Oslo, Dybwad. Kr. 8.00.

SHETELIG, H., and H. FALK, *Scandinavian Archæology*, trans. by E. V. Gordon. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21s.

English.*(a) General, including Linguistic.*

Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, xvi, ed. for M.H.R.A. by M. S. Serjeantson assisted by L. N. Broughton. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.

Arbeiten aus dem Seminar für englische Sprache und Kultur an der Hansischen Universität (Britannica, 13). Hamburg, Friederichsen, de Gruyter. 12 M.

FIEDLER, H. G., *A Contemporary of Shakespeare on Phonetics and on the Pronunciation of English and Latin* (Presidential Address, M.H.R.A.). London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 3s.

Hundred Best English Essays, A, ed. by R. Vallance. London, Nelson. 7s. 6d.

JAMES, D. G., *Scepticism and Poetry*. London, Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

JESPERSEN, O., *Analytic Syntax*. London, Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

JESPERSEN, O., *Linguistic Self-Criticism*; C. G. DARWIN, *Terminology in Physics*; Sir W. A. CRAIGIE, *The Irregularities of English* (S.P.E. Tract XLVIII). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.

KAISER, R., *Zur Geographie des mittellenglischen Wortschatzes* (Palaestra, 205). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller.

KENMARE, D., *The Future of Poetry*. London, Williams and Norgate. 3s. 6d.

Oxford Companion to English Literature, The, ed. by Sir Paul Harvey. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15s.

PARTRIDGE, E., *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. London, Routledge. 42s.

REUTER, O., *On Continuative Relative Clauses in English*. Helsingfors, Akademische Buchhandlung; Leipzig, Harrassowitz. Fmk. 25.

RICHARDS, I. A., *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.

(b) Old and Middle English.

Exeter Book, The, ed. by G. P. Krapp and E. V. K. Dobbie. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, Routledge. 18s.

(c) Modern English.

ABBOTT, C. C., *A Catalogue of Papers Relating to Boswell, Johnson and Sir William Forbes, found at Fettercairn House*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21s.

Acolastus, trans. by John Palsgrave, ed. by P. L. Carver (E.E.T.S., 202). London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 20s.

AINSWORTH, E. G., *Poor Collins*. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.

Arbor of Amorous Devices, The, 1597, ed. by H. E. Rollins. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s. 6d.

ATKINSON, D. F., *Edmund Spenser: A Bibliographical Supplement*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 13s. 6d.

BAGDASARIAN, W., *William Blake* (Swiss St. in English, 2). Zürich and Leipzig, M. Niehans.

BAKER, J. M., *Henry Crabb Robinson*. London, Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

BARNARD, E., *Shelley's Religion*. Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. 16s.

- BRAWNE, FANNY, *Letters to Fanny Keats*, ed. by F. Edgcombe. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- BROWN, C., *Some Letters and Miscellanea*, ed. by M. B. Forman. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- CECIL, A., *A Portrait of Thomas More*. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode. 16s.
- CECIL, W., *The Execution of Justice in England*. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$1.50.
- CHAPMAN, G., *Beckford*. London, Cape. 15s.
- COLERIDGE, H., *Letters*, ed. by G. E. and E. L. Griggs. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 15s.
- COWLING, G., *Shelley and other Essays*. Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses. 4s. 6d.
- CROFTS, J., *Shakespeare and the Post-Horses* (Univ. of Bristol St., 5). Bristol, Arrowsmith. 10s. 6d.
- DE REUL, P., *L'Œuvre de D. H. Lawrence*. Paris, Vrin. 20 fr.
- DELLA ROBBIA, E. V., *Vita di una Donna*. Florence, Sansoni. 12 L.
- Devotionarie Book of John Evelyn of Wotton, 1620-1706*, ed. by Walter Frere. London, Murray. 7s. 6d.
- EBISCH, W., and L. L. SCHÜCKING, *A Shakespeare Bibliography, Supplement, for the years 1930-35*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5s.
- ECKHOFF, L., *Bild und Wirklichkeit bei Thomas Carlyle*. Königsberg and Berlin, Ost-Europa Verlag. 7 M. 80.
- Elizabethan Tales*, ed. with an Introduction by E. J. O'Brien. London, Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.
- ELYOT, T., *The Castel of Helth*. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$4.00.
- FIRKINS, O. W., *Power and Elusiveness in Shelley*. Minnesota and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.
- GRABO, C., *The Magic Plant: The Growth of Shelley's Thought*. N. Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s.
- GRANGE, J., *The Golden Aphroditis*. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$3.00.
- GRANVILLE-BARKER, H., *Prefaces to Shakespeare*. London, Sidgwick and Jackson. 10s. 6d.
- GRIERSON, Sir H. J. C., *Milton and Wordsworth, Poets and Prophets*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- HARBAGE, A., *Cavalier Drama*. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, H. Milford. 11s. 6d.
- HOGAN, C. B., *A Bibliography of Edwin Arlington Robinson*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 34s.
- HOPKINS, G. M., *The Note-Books and Papers of*, ed. by H. House. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 25s.
- KELLY, J. A., *German Visitors to English Theatres in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s.
- KLEINEKE, W., *Englische Fürstenspiegel vom Policraticus Johannis von Salisbury bis zum Basiliikon Doron König Jakobs I.* (St. z. eng. Phil., xc). Halle, Niemeyer. 9 M.
- LANDOR, W. S., *Poetical Works*, ed. by S. Wheeler. 3 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 60s.
- LANGDALE, A. B., *Phineas Fletcher* (Columbia Univ. St. in Engl. and Comp. Lit., 125). Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.
- LOW, D. M., *Edward Gibbon, 1737-1794*. London, Chatto and Windus. 15s.

- McKILLOP, A. D., Samuel Richardson. N. Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s.
- MACLEAN, K., John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.
- MARTIN, A. D., The Religion of Wordsworth. London, Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.
- MILFORD, R. T., and D. M. SUTHERLAND, A Catalogue of English Newspapers and Periodicals in the Bodleian Library, 1622-1800. Oxford Bibliographical Society. 25s.
- MILTON, J., Paradise Regained, The Minor Poems, and Samson Agonistes, ed. by M. Y. Hughes. New York, Doubleday, Doran. \$1.00.
- MILTON, J., Works. Columbia ed., xii: Familiarum Epistolarum, Prolusiones, Miscellanies, Correspondence. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. £24 for 18 vols.
- MOSSNER, E. C., Bishop Butler and the Age of Reason. New York, Macmillan. 15s.
- NICCOLS, R., The Beggars Ape. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$1.50.
- OWLETT, F. C., Francis Thompson. London, Bumpus. 2s. 6d.
- PENNINK, B., Nederland en Shakespeare. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. Gld. 5.00.
- POPE, A., Prose Works, ed. by N. Ault. Vol. 1: 1711-1720. Oxford, Blackwell. 30s.
- SALE, W. M., Jr., Samuel Richardson, A Bibliographical Record. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., Sonnets, ed. by Tucker Brooke. New York and London, Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., King John, ed. by J. Dover Wilson. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.
- SHANKAR, B., Studies in Modern English Poetry. Allahabad, Students' Friends. 6s.
- SHANKS, E., Edgar Allan Poe. London, Macmillan. 6s.
- SHERARD, R. H., Bernard Shaw, Frank Harris and Oscar Wilde. Werner Laurie. 18s.
- SMITH, D. F., Plays about the Theatre in England. New York and London, Oxford Univ. Press. \$4.00.
- SPENSER, E., Works. Variorum ed., The Faerie Queene, v, ed. by R. Heffner. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 27s.
- TEERINK, H., A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. Gld. 20.
- TOMLINSON, W. E., Der Herodes-Charakter im englischen Drama. Leipzig, Mayer und Müller.
- TWYNE, T., Discourse on the Earthquake of 1580, ed. by R. E. Ockenden. Oxford, Pen-in-Hand Publishing Co. 5s.
- VAN DER NOOT, J., A Theatre for Voluptuous Worldlings. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$5.00.
- WEYGANDT, C., The Time of Tennyson. New York, Appleton-Century. 8s. 6d.
- WHITAKER, A., Good Newes from Virginia. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$1.50.
- WILSON, J. DOVER, The Meaning of 'The Tempest'. Newcastle, Literary and Philosophical Society. 1s.
- WINTERS, Y., Primitivism and Decadence, A Study of American Experimental Poetry. New York, Arrow Editions. \$2.50.
- WORDSWORTH, W. and D., Letters, ed. by E. de Selincourt. The Middle Years, 1806-1820. 2 vols. Oxford Clarendon Press. 42s.

German.

(a) *General, including Linguistic.*

- ALTENKIRCH, J., Die Namen der Gemarkungen Bingen und Rudesheim. Giessen, von Munchow.
- BACH, A., Deutsche Volkskunde. Ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Leipzig, Hirzel. 17 M. 80.
- BAETKE, W., Die Religion der Germanen in Quellenzeugnissen. Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 4 M. 60.
- BAUMGARTEN, A., Wissenschaft und Sprache. Basel, Reinhardt.
- Beiträge zur Erforschung der deutschen Zeitschrift. Hrsg. von E. Lehmann. Bd. 1-2. Berlin-Charlottenburg, Lorentz.
- BERANEK, F., Die Mundart von Südmähren (Lautlehre) (Beiträge zur Kenntnis der sudetendeutschen Mundarten, 7). Reichenberg, Kraus. 5 M
- BERETTA-PICCOLI, M., Die Benennung der weiblichen Kopftracht des Landvolkes der deutschen Schweiz (Schriften der Schweizer Gesell. f. Volkskunde, Bd. 24). Bern, Haupt. 10 Fr.
- BUCHER, J., Die Flurnamen des Dorfs Wörrstadt in Rheinhessen. Giessen, von Munchow.
- CAPELLE, W., Das alte Germanien. Die Nachrichten der griechischen und römischen Schriftsteller. Jena, Diederichs. 4 M. 80.
- CHRISTA, J., Wörter und Wendungen der Prümer Mundart. Prüm, Christa.
- Deutschen Nationalbibliographie, Zetteldrucke der, Hrsg. vom Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler zu Leipzig. Reihe A. Leipzig, Börsenverein d. D. Buchhändler. Jeder Zettel 0 M. 03.
- Deutschen Nationalbibliographie, Zetteldrucke der, Hrsg. vom Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler zu Leipzig. Reihe B. Leipzig, Börsenverein d. D. Buchhändler. Jeder Zettel 0 M. 03.
- Deutsche Seminar der Universität Köln, Das. Jena, Diederichs.
- Die Indogermanen- und Germanenfrage. Neue Wege zu ihrer Lösung. Institut f. Völkerkunde. (Wiener Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Linguistik, Jg. 4.) Salzburg, Pustet. 21 M. 60.
- DRACH, E., Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre. Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 2 M. 80.
- ECKERLE, J., Die Mundarten der Landschaft Freiburg im Breisgau (Bausteine zur Volkskunde und Religionswissenschaft, H. 14). Buhl, Konkordia. 4 M.
- Edda. Die Lieder des Codex regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. Hrsg. von G. Neckel. (German. Bibliothek, Abt. 2, Bd. 9.) 1. Text. 3. Aufl. Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 75.
- FEHRLE, E., Deutsche Hochzeitsbräuche (Volksart und Brauch). Jena, Diederichs. 1 M. 80.
- Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Paul Kretschmer. 2. (Glotta, Bd. 25, H. 3/4.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 10 M.
- FISCHER, J., Das Jiddische und sein Verhältnis zu den deutschen Mundarten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der ostgalizischen Mundart, Teil 1 (Lautlehre). Leipzig, Schmidt.
- HARTMANN, E., Die Trollvorstellungen in den Sagen und Märchen der skandinavischen Völker (Tübinger germanist. Arbeiten, Bd. 23 = Sonderreihe: Studien zur nord. Philologie, Bd. 4). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 9 M.
- HESSE, R., Tierv Verbreitung und Sprachverbreitung. Berlin, De Gruyter. 1 M.
- Hessisches Ortsnamenbuch, Bd. 1. (3 Hefte) H. 1. Starkenburg, Bearb. von W. Müller. (Arbeiten der Hist. Kommission f. d. Volksstaat Hessen.) Darmstadt, Hist. Kommission f. d. Volksstaat Hessen. 6 M.

- McKILLOP, A. D., Samuel Richardson. N. Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s.
- MACLEAN, K., John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.
- MARTIN, A. D., The Religion of Wordsworth. London, Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d.
- MILFORD, R. T., and D. M. SUTHERLAND, A Catalogue of English Newspapers and Periodicals in the Bodleian Library, 1622-1800. Oxford Bibliographical Society. 25s.
- MILTON, J., Paradise Regained, The Minor Poems, and Samson Agonistes, ed. by M. Y. Hughes. New York, Doubleday, Doran. \$1.00.
- MILTON, J., Works. Columbia ed., XII: Familiarum Epistolarum, Prolusiones, Miscellanies, Correspondence. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. £24 for 18 vols.
- MOSSNER, E. C., Bishop Butler and the Age of Reason. New York, Macmillan. 15s.
- NICCOLS, R., The Beggars Ape. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$1.50.
- OWLETT, F. C., Francis Thompson. London, Bumpus. 2s. 6d.
- PENNINK, B., Nederland en Shakespeare. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. Gld. 5.00.
- POPE, A., Prose Works, ed. by N. Ault. Vol. 1: 1711-1720. Oxford, Blackwell. 30s.
- SALE, W. M., Jr., Samuel Richardson, A Bibliographical Record. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., Sonnets, ed. by Tucker Brooke. New York and London, Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., King John, ed. by J. Dover Wilson. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.
- SHANKAR, B., Studies in Modern English Poetry. Allahabad, Students' Friends. 6s.
- SHANKS, E., Edgar Allan Poe. London, Macmillan. 6s.
- SHERARD, R. H., Bernard Shaw, Frank Harris and Oscar Wilde. Werner Laurie. 18s.
- SMITH, D. F., Plays about the Theatre in England. New York and London, Oxford Univ. Press. \$4.00.
- SPENSER, E., Works. Variorum ed., The Faerie Queene, v, ed. by R. Heffner. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 27s.
- TEERINK, H., A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. Gld. 20.
- TOMLINSON, W. E., Der Herodes-Charakter im englischen Drama. Leipzig, Mayer und Müller.
- TWYNE, T., Discourse on the Earthquake of 1580, ed. by R. E. Ockenden. Oxford, Pen-in-Hand Publishing Co. 5s.
- VAN DER NOOT, J., A Theatre for Voluptuous Worldlings. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$5.00.
- WEYGANDT, C., The Time of Tennyson. New York, Appleton-Century. 8s. 6d.
- WHITAKER, A., Good Newes from Virginia. New York, Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$1.50.
- WILSON, J. DOVER, The Meaning of 'The Tempest'. Newcastle, Literary and Philosophical Society. 1s.
- WINTERS, Y., Primitivism and Decadence, A Study of American Experimental Poetry. New York, Arrow Editions. \$2.50.
- WORDSWORTH, W. and D., Letters, ed. by E. de Selincourt. The Middle Years, 1806-1820. 2 vols. Oxford Clarendon Press. 42s.

German.

(a) *General, including Linguistic.*

- ALTENKIRCH, J., Die Namen der Gemarkungen Bingen und Rudesheim. Giessen, von Münchow.
- BACH, A., Deutsche Volkskunde. Ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Leipzig, Hirzel. 17 M. 80.
- BAETKE, W., Die Religion der Germanen in Quellenzeugnissen. Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 4 M. 60.
- BAUMGARTEN, A., Wissenschaft und Sprache. Basel, Reinhardt.
- Beiträge zur Erforschung der deutschen Zeitschrift. Hrsg. von E. Lehmann. Bd. 1-2. Berlin-Charlottenburg, Lorentz.
- BERANEK, F., Die Mundart von Südmähren (Lautlehre) (Beiträge zur Kenntnis der sudetendeutschen Mundarten, 7). Reichenberg, Kraus. 5 M.
- BERETTA-PICCOLI, M., Die Benennung der weiblichen Kopftracht des Landvolkes der deutschen Schweiz (Schriften der Schweizer Gesell. f. Volkskunde, Bd. 24). Bern, Haupt. 10 Fr.
- BUCHER, J., Die Flurnamen des Dorfs Worrstadt in Rheinhessen. Giessen, von Münchow.
- CAPELLE, W., Das alte Germanien. Die Nachrichten der griechischen und römischen Schriftsteller. Jena, Diederichs. 4 M. 80.
- CHRISTA, J., Wörter und Wendungen der Prümer Mundart. Prüm, Christa.
- Deutschen Nationalbibliographie, Zetteldrucke der, Hrsg. vom Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler zu Leipzig. Reihe A. Leipzig, Börsenverein d. D. Buchhändler. Jeder Zettel 0 M. 03.
- Deutschen Nationalbibliographie, Zetteldrucke der, Hrsg. vom Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler zu Leipzig. Reihe B. Leipzig, Börsenverein d. D. Buchhändler. Jeder Zettel 0 M. 03.
- Deutsche Seminar der Universität Köln, Das. Jena, Diederichs.
- Die Indogermanen- und Germanenfrage. Neue Wege zu ihrer Lösung. Institut f. Völkerkunde. (Wiener Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Linguistik, Jg. 4.) Salzburg, Pustet. 21 M. 60.
- DRACH, E., Grundgedanken der deutschen Satzlehre. Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 2 M. 80.
- ECKERLE, J., Die Mundarten der Landschaft Freiburg im Breisgau (Bausteine zur Volkskunde und Religionswissenschaft, H. 14). Bühl, Konkordia. 4 M.
- Edda. Die Lieder des Codex regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. Hrsg. von G. Neckel. (German. Bibliothek, Abt. 2, Bd. 9.) 1. Text. 3. Aufl. Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 75.
- FEHRLE, E., Deutsche Hochzeitsbräuche (Volksart und Brauch). Jena, Diederichs. 1 M. 80.
- Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Paul Kretschmer. 2. (Glotta, Bd. 25, H. 3/4.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 10 M.
- FISCHER, J., Das Jiddische und sein Verhältnis zu den deutschen Mundarten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der ostgalizischen Mundart, Teil 1 (Lautlehre). Leipzig, Schmidt.
- HARTMANN, E., Die Trollvorstellungen in den Sagen und Märchen der skandinavischen Völker (Tübinger germanist. Arbeiten, Bd. 23=Sonderreihe: Studien zur nord. Philologie, Bd. 4). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 9 M.
- HESSE, R., Tierverbreitung und Sprachverbreitung. Berlin, De Gruyter. 1 M.
- Hessisches Ortsnamenbuch, Bd. 1. (3 Hefte) H. 1. Starkenburg, Bearb. von W. Müller. (Arbeiten der Hist. Kommission f. d. Volksstaat Hessen.) Darmstadt, Hist. Kommission f. d. Volksstaat Hessen. 6 M.

- HIRT, H., Indogermanische Grammatik, Teil 7 (Indogermanische Bibliothek, Abt. 1, Reihe 1, Bd. 13, 7). Heidelberg, Winter. 12 M. 50.
- HOVELMANN, W., Die Eingangsformeln in germanischer Dichtung. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.
- Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung... hrsg. von John Meier. Jg. 5. Berlin, De Gruyter. 12 M.
- JANNOCH, H., Die deutsch-tschechische Sprachgrenze am Fusse des Hohen Bohmerwaldes. Leipzig, Jordan und Gramberg. 3 M.
- KEESENBERG, H., Die Flurnamen von Wilhelmsburg, Neuhoof und Kattwiek-Hohe Schaar. Harburg-Wilhelmsburg, Schüte.
- KINDERMANN, H., Dichtung und Volkheit. Grundzüge einer neuen Literaturwissenschaft. Berlin, Junker und Dünnhaupt. 3 M. 50.
- KÖHLER, H.-D., Studien zur Ura-Linda-Chronik. Weimar, Bohlau.
- KOLESCH, H., Schwabentum im Schwabenlied (Arbeiten aus dem Institut f. dt. Volkskunde. Volk, Volkstum, Volkskultur, Bd. 1). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 9 M.
- KORNHARDT, H., Exemplum. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie. Borna-Leipzig, Noske.
- Lebendiges Erbe. Festschrift aus dem Kreis der Mitarbeiter an der Monumentalsammlung 'Deutsche Literatur' zum 60. Geburtstage ihres Verlegers Dr. Ernst Reclam (Deutsche Literatur). Leipzig, Reclam. 4 M. 50.
- LECHNER, H., Kleine Literaturgeschichte des deutschen Sprachraumes. 2. Aufl. Innsbruck, Tyrolia. 3 M. 60.
- LORENZ, E., Die Entwicklung des deutschen Zeitschriftenwesens. Eine statistische Untersuchung. (Beiträge zur Erforschung der deutschen Zeitschrift, Bd. 1.) Berlin-Charlottenburg, Lorentz. 5 M. 80.
- LOTHER, H., Die Christauffassung der Germanen. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann. 1 M.
- Mitteilungen des Instituts für Zeitungswissenschaft an der Universität Berlin. Berlin, Inst.
- MUCH, R., Die Germania des Tacitus (German. Bibliothek, Abt. 1, Reihe 5, Bd. 3). Heidelberg, Winter. 12 M.
- MÜLLER, G., Zur Anthropologie der Langobarden. Wien, Anthropol. Gesell. 1 M. 60.
- NATAU, O., Mundart und Siedelung im nordöstlichen Ostpreussen (Schriften der Albertus-Universität, Geisteswiss. Reihe, Bd. 4). Königsberg, Ost-Europa Verlag. 10 M. 50.
- NAUMANN, I., Altgermanisches Frauenleben (Deutsche Reihe, Bd. 47). Jena, Diederichs. 0 M. 80.
- PETRI, F., Germanisches Volkserbe in Wallonien und Nord-Frankreich. Die frank. Landnahme in Frankreich und den Niederlanden und die Bildung der westlichen Sprachgrenze. Bobb, Röhrscheid. 25 M.
- PLOETZ, H., Die Theorie der Dichtung. Berlin, Tritsch und Huther.
- PRATSCHER, V., Eine gemischtsprachige Gemeinde in Jugoslawien mit deutscher Minderheit. Die Deutschen der Gemeinde Feketić-Feketitsch. Novi Vrbas, Pleess. 45 Din.
- RENN, G., Die Bedeutung des Namens 'Pommern' und die Bezeichnungen für das heutige Pommern in der Geschichte (Greifswalder Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 88). Greifswald, Bamberg. 3 M. 60.
- REYKERS, H., Die isländische Ächtersage. Marburg, Bauer.
- RIEGER, A., Die Mundart der Bezirke Romerstadt und Sternberg (Beiträge zur Kenntnis der sudetendeutschen Mundarten, 8). Reichenberg, Kraus. 2 M. 50.

- ROEDDER, E., Volkssprache und Wortschatz des badischen Frankenlandes (The Modern Language Association of America, General Series). London, Oxford University Press. 22s. 6d.
- ROSE, E., Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung auf kulturgeschichtlicher Grundlage. New York, Prentice-Hall. \$2.75.
- ROSTOSKY, L., Spielgestaltung im Volksspiel. Leipzig, Glaser. 2 M.
- SAUER, H., Die Schuldvorstellungen in ostpreussischen und westfälischen Volkserzählungen der Gegenwart (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Deutsche Volkskunde, Bd. 1). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 4 M. 80.
- SCHILLING, H., Germanisches Leben (Die Koehler-Reihe). Leipzig, Koehler und Amelang. 2 M. 85.
- SCHNEIDER, H., Über die ältesten Götterlieder der Nordgermanen (Sitzungsberichte der Bayr. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Abt., Jg. 1936, H. 7). München, Beck in Komm. 3 M. 40.
- SZADROWSKY, M., Aus dem Leben der Gebirgsmundarten. Bern, Stampfli.
- TRUPP, H., Die Personennamen des Gladbacher Urkundenbuches bis zum Jahre 1600. Essen, Trupp.
- WALD, M., Erklärung der Orts- und Flurnamen auf dem Niederen Fläming (Flämingheft, 26). Dahme, Selbstverlag. 0 M. 30.
- WALZEL, O., Grenzen von Poesie und Unpoesie. Frankfurt a.M., Schulte-Bulmke. 9 M. 50.
- WERNER, B., Die alten Namen der Gemarkung Butzbach. Giessen, von Münchow.
- WOLTERS, F., und PETERSEN, C., Die Heldensagen der germanischen Frühzeit. 4. Aufl. Breslau, Hirt. 3 M. 50.
- (b) *Old Saxon and Low German.*
- BODENS, W., Sage, Marchen und Schwank am Niederrhein, gesammelt und herausgegeben (Deutsches Volkstum am Rhein, 3). Bonn, Röhrscheid. 8 M.
- Deutsche Mundarten. Niederdeutsch aus Kleinwusterwitz (Lautbibliothek, Nr. 38). Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 1 M. 50.
- Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch. Hrsg. vom Verein für Niedersächsisches Volkstum. Bremen, Osterdeich.
- TIEDEMANN, C., Gustav Stille. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der niederdeutschen Literatur des 20. Jahrhunderts. Stade, Hansa-Druckerei.
- (c) *Old and Middle High German.*
- ACKEN, J. VAN, Germanische Frömmigkeit in liturgischen Hymnen. Freiburg, Caritasverlag. 2 M. 20.
- BAUER, G.-K., Sternkunde und Sterndeutung der Deutschen im 9.-14. Jahrhundert unter Ausschluss der reinen Fachwissenschaft (Germanische Studien, H. 186). Berlin, Ebering. 7 M. 20.
- BERTHELT, E., Gewandschilderungen in der erzählenden höfischen Dichtung des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts. Emsdetten, Lechte.
- BODENSOHN, H., Die Festschilderungen in der mhd. Dichtung (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, H. 9). Münster, Aschendorff. 3 M. 90.
- BRUCKNER, A., Palaographische Studien zu den älteren St Galler Urkunden. St Gallen, Fehr. 3 Fr. 50.
- Burg Wildenberg, Die Gralsburg im Odenwald. Hrsg. von F. Droop. Amorbach, Wildenberg-Verlag. 1 M.
- CARLISCH-EINIGER, E., Die lateinischen Elemente in der mittelhochdeutschen Epik des 13. Jahrhunderts (Prager deutsche Studien, H. 47). Reichenberg, Kraus. 11 M.

- CUCUEL, E., Die Eingangsbücher des Parzival und das Gesamtwerk (Deutsche Forschungen, Bd. 30). Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 3 M. 60.
- DINKLER, E., Gottschalk der Sachse. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach Germanentum und Christentum. Mit lat. Hymnen Gottschalks. Übertragen ins Deutsche von E. Wissmann. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 2 M.
- EMMEL, H., Das Verhältnis von *êre* und *triuwe* im Nibelungenlied und bei Hartmann und Wolfram (Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur german. und roman. Philologie, H. 14). Frankfurt a.M., Diesterweg. 2 M.
- GAHR, C., Die Deutschen Christen und ihre Geschichte vor Bonifatius. Memmingen, Druckerei und Verlagsgenossenschaft 'Allgauer Beobachter'.
- GRABMANN, M., Mittelalterliche Deutung und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre von *vous poietikos* nach einer Zusammenstellung im Cod. B III der Universitätsbibliothek Basel (Sitzungsberichte der Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Philos.-hist. Abt., Jg. 1936, H. 4). München, Beck. 6 M. 50.
- GROSS, H., Hartmanns Büchlein, dargestellt in seiner psychologischen, ethischen und theologischen Bezogenheit auf das Gesamtwerk des Dichters. Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M.
- HECHTLE, M., Walther von der Vogelweide. Studien zur Geschichte der Forschung. (Deutsche Arbeiten der Universität Köln, 11.) Jena, Diederichs. 3 M. 60.
- HERMANN, H., Die westeuropäischen Handschriften und Inkunabeln der Gotik und der Renaissance mit Ausnahme der niederländischen Handschriften, 2. (Publikationen d. Kunst-hist. Inst. d. Univ. Wien in Verb. mit d. Österr. Inst. f. Geschichtsforschung.) Leipzig, Hiersemann. 140 M.
- KEFERSTEIN, G., Parzivals ethischer Weg. Ritterlicher Lebensstil im deutschen Hochmittelalter. (Literatur und Leben, Bd. 10.) Weimar, Böhlau. 3 M. 60.
- KEFERSTEIN, G., Parzivals ethischer Sieg. Zur Charakterisierung des ritterlichen Stils im deutschen Hochmittelalter. (Literatur und Leben, Bd. 10.) Weimar, Böhlau.
- LANG, M., Tannhauser (Von deutscher Poeterey, Bd. 17). Leipzig, Weber. 13 M.
- LIERSCH, C., Motivgeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zur alemannischen Magdalenenlegende. Marburg/Lahn, Friedrich.
- LIPPHARDT, W., Studien zu den Marienklagen. Halle, Niemeyer.
- Mitteilungen des Wolfram von Eschenbach-Bundes, H. 1 (Burg Wildenberg und Wolfram von Eschenbach). Amorbach, Wildenberg-Verlag. 0 M. 60.
- PFLEGER, C., Untersuchungen am deutschen geistlichen Lied des 13. bis 16. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Melodiengeschichte des Mittelalters. Berlin, Triltsch und Huther.
- RAST, E., Vergleich, Gleichnis, Metapher und Allegorie bei Konrad von Würzburg. Würzburg, Mayr.
- RITTER, G., Erasmus und der deutsche Humanistenkreis am Oberrhein (Freiburger Universitätsreden, H. 23). Freiburg, Wagnersche Universitätsbuchhandlung. 1 M. 50.
- SCHULTZ, J., Wandlungen der Seele im Hochmittelalter, Bd. 2. Breslau, Marcus. 7 M. 20.
- STRUBE, E. VON, Innozenz' III. politische Korrespondenz und die religiöse Weltherrschaftsidee der Kurie. Libau, Mayr.
- THIELE, G., Der Ursprungsraum des Passionalspiels. Weimar, Uschmann.
- WEBER, A., Studien zur Abwandlung der höfischen Ethik in der Spruchdichtung des 14. Jahrhunderts. Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M. 60.
- WIBTGEN, B., Die Handschriften des Klosters St Peter und Paul zu Erfurt bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts. Gräfenhainichen, Heine.

(d) *Early New High German.*

- BERGER, A., Die Schaubühne im Dienst der Reformation (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Reformation, Bd. 6). Leipzig, Reclam. M. 20.
- BIESSMANN, K., Das fürstlich-sächsische Amt Heldburg um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts, dargestellt auf Grund eines Erbbuches vom Jahre 1570. Hildburghausen, Gadow.
- BORNKAMM, H., Eckhart und Luther. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 1 M. 80.
- CYSARZ, H., Vor- und Frühbarock (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Barock: Barocklyrik, Bd. 1). Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- FISCHER, H., Die ältesten Zeitungen und ihre Verleger. Hrsg. vom Augsburger Stadtverband, ... Augsburg, Schwabenland-Verlag. 7 M.
- FRITZ, M., Die Liedersammlung des Paulus von der Aelst, Deventer 1602. Lengerich, Lengericher Handelsdr.
- GAITANIDES, H., Georg Rudolf Weckherlin. Versuch einer physiolog. Stilanalyse. München, Ebner.
- HOLLMANN, W., Alte deutsche Zeitungen. Bilder und Gestalten aus der Frühgeschichte des deutschen Zeitungswesens (1600–1900) (Meyers bunte Bandchen, 37). Leipzig, Bibliogr. Institut. 0 M. 90.
- LEIDINGER, G., Veit Arnepecks 'Chronik der Bayern' (Sitzungsberichte der Bayr. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Abt., Jg. 1936, H. 5). München, Beck in Komm. 1 M. 20.
- Luther, Martin, Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel. Bd. 7. Weimar, Bohlau. 39 M. 30.
- MATTHES, K., Luther und die Obrigkeit (Aus der Welt christlicher Frömmigkeit, H. 12). München, Reinhardt. 4 M. 80.
- MAYER, A., Erdmutter und Hexe. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des Hexenglaubens und zur Vorgeschichte der Hexenprozesse (Hist. Forschungen und Quellen, H. 12). München, Datterer. 3 M. 20.
- PFÜTZENREUTER, W., Herzog Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig und der norddeutsche Spathumanismus. Dülmen i. Westf., Laumann.
- Rothe, J., Der Ritterspiegel. Hrsg. von H. Neumann. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, Nr. 38.) Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M. 20.
- WEHMER, C., Das älteste Schriftmusterblatt einer deutschen Druckerei. (Erhard Ratdolt) Augsburg, 1486. Gräfenhainichen, Heine.

(e) *Modern German.*

- APT, A., Caroline und die Frühromantische Gesellschaft. Dresden, Germania Buchdr.
- ARENHÖVEL, W., Die Künstlerpersonlichkeit in der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland entwickelt aus dem Schrifttum der bildenden Künstler. Bückeburg, Prinz.
- Arndt, Ernst Moritz, Ernst Moritz Arndts Briefe an seinen Schwiegervater. Hrsg. E. Gülzow. (Grimmener Heimatbücherei, H. 3.) Grimmen, Waberg. 0 M. 50.
- ASCH, O., Bildsprache und Humor als Ausdruck geistiger Reife. Würzburg, Triltsch. 4 M.
- AUGUSTIN, G., Nietzsches religiöse Entwicklung. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 5 M. 40.
- Aurora. Ein romantischer Almanach. Jahresgabe der Deutschen Eichendorff-Stiftung. Hrsg. von K. Sezodrok. Oppeln, Verlag 'Der Oberschlesier'. 3 M.
- BARTZ, W., Fremdwort und Sprachreinigung bei Friedrich Ludwig Jahn. Greifswald, Adler.
- BERL, H., Baden-Baden im Zeitalter der Romantik. Die literar. und musikal. Romantik des 19. Jahrhunderts. Baden-Baden, Brockhoff. 5 M.

- BETZ, I., Der Tod in der deutschen Dichtung des Impressionismus. Würzburg, Triltsch. 4 M.
- BIEDER, T., Adolf Stern und seine Beziehungen zu Friedrich Hebbel. Hrsg. im Auftrag der Hebbelgemeinde. Berlin, Behr's Verlag. 2 M. 50.
- BIRCH, E., Der biographische Roman in der neuen deutschen Dichtung. Brinkum-Bremen, Hillje.
- BOCK, H.-J., Grundzüge von Wilhelm Raabes Weltanschauung und Kunst aufgewiesen an den 'Alten Nestern' (Deutsche Studien zur Geistesgeschichte, H. 3). Würzburg, Triltsch. 2 M. 50.
- BORRASS, K., Hoffnung und Erinnerung als Struktur von Hardenbergs Welthaltung und deren Verhältnis zur Form. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.
- BROSCHKE, K., Schleiermachers Ansichten über Volk, Staat und Volkserziehung. Helmstedt, Kuhne.
- CÄMMERER, H., Rainer Maria Rilkes Duineser Elegien. Deutung und Dichtung. Stuttgart, Metzler. 4 M. 50.
- CASPAR, P. und KUGELGEN, G. VON, Dichter in der Handschrift. Graphologische Deutungen zeitgenössischer Dichtwerke. Hannover, Sponholtz. 7 M. 50.
- CASTELLE, F., Lons-Gedenkbuch. Neue Bearbeitung. Bad Pyrmont, Hannover, Gersbach. 4 M. 80.
- CLEMEN, E., Der Stil der Kunstprosa bei Paul Ernst. Greifswald, Adler.
- DIEHL, O., Stefan George und das Deutschtum. Giessen, von Münchow.
- DILTHEY, W., Briefe Wilhelm Diltheys an Rudolf Haym 1861-1873. Mitgeteilt von E. Weniger. Berlin, De Gruyter. 3 M.
- DUTTLE, M., Ruckerts Verskunst. Nürnberg, Spindler. 2 M.
- ECKERT, K., Das Bildnis der klassizistisch-romantischen Epoche in Deutschland. Koslin, Hendess. 4 M.
- ENGELMAYER, O., Die Deutschlandideologie der Franzosen. Ihre geistesgeschichtlichen Grundlagen. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Volkslehre und Gesellschaftskunde, Bd. 10.) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 6 M.
- FLEISCHER, R., Buchhändlerfamilie Fleischer in der Zeit Goethes. Leipzig, Fleischer. 3 M. 50.
- FRANKE, G., Mittel zur Darstellung des Übersinnlichen auf der Bühne, nachgewiesen an Aufführungen des Goetheschen Faust I. Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M.
- FRANZ, E., Deutsche Klassik und Reformation. Die Weiterbildung protestant. Motive in der Philosophie und Weltanschauung des deutschen Idealismus. (Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift f. Lit.-wiss. und Geistesgesch., Buchreihe, Bd. 22.) 16 M.
- FREITAG, K., Hermann Stehr. Gehalt und Gestalt seiner Dichtung, I. Groningen Batavia, Wolters.
- Frühromantik, Krisenjahre der. Briefe aus dem Schlegelkreis, hrsg. von J. Korner. Bd. 1. Brunn, Rohrer. 42 M.
- GAMMA, M., Das Rütli. 75 Jahre Nationaleigentum. 1860-1935. Hrsg. von der Rütlikommission. Altdorf, Gamma.
- Goethes Ehe in Briefen. Hrsg. von H. Graf. Potsdam, Rütten und Loening. 8 M. 50.
- GOETZ, W., Fünfzig Jahre Goethe-Gesellschaft (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, Bd. 49). Weimar, Goethe-Ges.
- GRÄFE, G., Die Gestalt des Literaten im Zeitroman des 19. Jahrhunderts (Germanische Studien, H. 185). Berlin, Ebering. 5 M. 40.
- Grillparzer, F., Samtliche Werke. Hrsg. von A. Sauer, fortgef. von R. Backmann. Abt. 1, 5 (Der Traum ein Leben, Weh dem, der lügt!). Wien, Schroll. 12 M.

- GROLMAN, A. VON, *Werk und Wirklichkeit. 3 Kapitel vom Dichterischen Schaffen.* Johann Peter Hebel, Emil Gott, Hans Thoma. Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 6 M.
- GRUTZMACHER, R., *Goethes Faust. Ein deutscher Mythos, Teil 1.* Berlin, Stilke. 7 M. 50.
- HAINEBACH, H., *Studien zum literarischen Leben der Aufklärungszeit in Mainz.* Giessen.
- HAMMER, L., *Das Wahlen in Freiheit als Mittel zur Konfliktverschärfung im modernen Drama.* Würzburg, Tritsch.
- HAMPE, E., *Der Pessimismus M. Solitaires (1818-1869) (German. Studien, H. 183).* Berlin, Ebering. 7 M. 20.
- Hebbel, Friedrich. *Tagebücher...* Hrsg. von G. Fricke. Bd. 1-3. Leipzig, Reclam. Je 2 M. 45.
- HEIDEGGER, M., *Holderlin und das Wesen der Dichtung.* München, Langen/Müller. 0 M. 60.
- HEISELER, B. VON, Stefan George (Colemans kleine Biographien, Bd. 67). Lubeck, Coleman. 0 M. 70.
- HEYD, G., *Goethe als Mensch und Deutscher (Die Goethe-Bücher).* Hamburg, Gesellschaft der Goethe-Freunde. 2 M. 60.
- HOCK, E., *Das Schmerzerlebnis und sein Ausdruck in Grillparzers Lyrik (Germanische Studien, H. 187).* Berlin, Ebering. 10 M. 40.
- HOFMANN, I., *Studien zum Goethe-Schillerschen Briefwechsel (Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur german. und roman. Philologie, H. 16).* 2 M. 20.
- HOOFF, C., *Komik und Humor bei Heinrich von Kleist (German. Studien, H. 184).* Berlin, Ebering. 3 M. 20.
- JACOB, G., *Das Theaternuseum der Stadt Mannheim (Schriften der Stadt Mannheim, H. 1).* Mannheim, Der Oberbürgermeister.
- JAGDHUEN, G., *Die Dichtungen Friedrichs des Grossen.* Erlangen, Junge und Sohn.
- JAHN, G., *Studien zu Eichendorffs Prosastil (Palaestra, 206).* Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 8 M. 80.
- Jahresbericht der preussischen Staatsbibliothek.* Berlin, De Gruyter. 2 M. 25.
- KINDT, H., *Görres' Rheinischer Merkur und die deutsche Presse seiner Zeit.* Braunschweig, Limbach.
- KIRSCHSTEIN, E.-A., *Die Familienzeitschrift. Ihre Entwicklung und Bedeutung für die deutsche Presse. (Beiträge zur Erforschung der deutschen Zeitschrift, Bd. 2.)* Berlin-Charlottenburg, Lorentz. 8 M. 40.
- KLAIBER, J., *Die Aktform im Drama und auf dem Theater. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Theatergeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts.* Berlin, Michel.
- Kleist, Heinrich von, *Briefe.* Hrsg. G. Minde-Pouet. (Insel-Bucherei, Nr. 506.) Leipzig, Insel-Verlag.
- KLUCKHOHN, P., *Vorbereitung (der Frühromantik) (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Romantik, Bd. 2).* Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- KOCH, F., *Die burschenschaftliche Bewegung in Kiel 1836-1855 (Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte der Burschenschaften und der deutschen Einheitsbewegung, Beih. 6).* Berlin, Verlag der deutschen Burschenschaft. 1 M. 20.
- KOCH, H., *Paul Ernst und das tragische Herrscherideal (Deutsches Werden, H. 8).* Greifswald, Bamberg. 4 M. 50.
- KOLBENHEYER, E., *Wie wurde der deutsche Roman?* München, Langen/Müller. 0 M. 50.

- KULLMER, E., Auffassung und Bedeutung des Todes im Werk Rainer Maria Rilkes. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.
- KUNZ, G., Theodor Storms Verhältnis zur Volkspoesie. Frankfurt a.M., Schroder.
- LAAG, H., Ernst Moritz Arndt—ein Christ? (Schriftenreihe des Dt. Evang. Männerwerkes, 8.) Potsdam, Stiftungsverlag. 0 M. 10.
- LANGENBUCHER, H., Deutsche Dichtung im Spiegel der Literaturgeschichten von Hellmuth Langenbucher und Christian Jenssen. Leipzig, List.
- LANGNER, E., Form- und Farbenbeachtung und psychophysische Konstitution bei zeitgenössischen Dichtern. Würzburg, Sturtz.
- LIESSEM, T., Willi Ostermann. Leben und Wirken des rheinischen Volkshederdichters. Köln, Hofer. 3 M. 50.
- LÖNS-ERBECK, E., Meine Erinnerungen an Hermann Lons. Dortmund, Lensing. 2 M. 90.
- LUDENDORFF, M., Lessings Geisteskampf und Lebensschicksal. München, Ludendorffs Verlag. 3 M. 50.
- MANN, T., Ein Briefwechsel. Oprecht, Zürich. 1s. 6d.
- MARTINU, K., Klopstock im Raum der Nation. Düsseldorf, Nolte.
- MAY, K., Faust II. In der Sprachform gedeutet (Neue Forschungen, 30). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 12 M.
- MEYER, P., Erinnerungen an Theodor Fontane. 1819–98. Aus dem Nachlass seines Freundes und Testamentvollstreckers Justizr. Paul Meyer. Berlin, Saladruck.
- MICHELS, J., Goethes Werther. Beiträge zum Formenproblem des jungen Goethe. Kiel, Lipsius und Tischer.
- MOLZ, H., Die elsässische Presse im 18. Jahrhundert bis zum Ausbruch der Revolution (Schriften der Elsass-Lothr. Wissenschaftl. Gesell. zu Strassburg. Reihe A, Bd. 17). Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 20.
- MÜLLENHOFF, K., Briefwechsel zwischen Karl Müllenhoff und Wilhelm Scherer. ...Hrsg. A. Leitzmann. (Das Literatur-Archiv, Bd. 5.) Berlin, de Gruyter. 14 M.
- NÄGELI, E., Johann Wilhelm Simler als Dichter. Uster, Weilenmann.
- OESTERLING, W., Geschichte der Literatur in Baden, Teil 2 (Heimatblätter vom Bodensee zum Main, Nr. 44). Von Hebel bis Scheffel. Karlsruhe, Müller. 3 M. 90.
- Otto Ludwig-Kalender. Jahrbuch des Otto Ludwig-Vereins. Hrsg. ... W. Greiner. Jg. 9. Weimar, Bohlau. 2 M.
- PALMER, P., and MORE, R., The sources of the Faust tradition. London, Milford. 14s.
- Paul, Jean. Samtliche Werke. Hist.-krit. Ausgabe, Herausgegeben von der Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften. Bd. 12 (Freiheits-Büchlein). Weimar, Bohlau. 25 M. 65.
- PAULY, W., Das Verfahren der Umwertung bei Friedrich Nietzsche, seine Anwendung und Kritik. Borna-Leipzig, Noske.
- PEINE, M., Das politisch-historische Drama von 1923 bis 1933. Berlin, Triltsch und Huther.
- PERKONIG, J., Rudolf Hans Bartsch ('Oesterreichs' letzter Dichter). Eine Studie. Leipzig, Staakmann.
- PETRÓCZI, S., Kunstlertypen bei Tieck (Specimena dissertationum facultatis philosophicae Regiae Hungaricae Universitatis Elisabethinae Quinqueecclesiensis, 94). Pécs (Fünfkirchen), Egyetemi könyvkiadó es nyomda.
- POLAG, H., E. M. Arndts Weg zum Deutschen. Leipzig, Eichblatt.

- POLL, M., Joseph Edmund Jorg. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Publizistik in der 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Paderborn, Schöningh.
- POLZER HODITZ, A. Graf, Uriel Birnbach. Dichter, Maler, Denker. (Die Schriftenreihe der Garbe.) Wien, Dr H. Glanz in Komm. 2 M.
- RAITH, W., Carl Spitteler und die neue Gemeinschaft. Limburg an der Lahn, Limburger Vereinsdruckerei.
- RASSMANN, J., Das dramatische Schaffen Levin Schückings. Ohlau i. Schles., Eschenhagen.
- RHEINLANDER-MOHL, A., Umbruch des Geistes in seiner Auswirkung auf die literarische Situation der Gegenwart. Nachgewiesen an der zeitbedingten und artfremden Romankunst Franz Werfels. Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus.
- RHEINLÄNDER-SCHMITT, H., Dekadenz und ihre Überwindung bei Hugo von Hofmannsthal. Münster i.W., Heisterkamp.
- RUDLOFF-HILLE, G., Die Bayreuther Hofbühne im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Bayreuth, Hist. Verein f. Oberfranken.
- RUPRECHT, K., Wilhelm Heinrich Riehls 'Kulturgeschichtliche Novellen' mit Berücksichtigung ihres Verhältnisses zur Quelle Königsberg, Escher.
- SALIS, J., Rainer Maria Rilkes Schweizer Jahre (Die Schweiz im Deutschen Geistesleben, III. Reihe, Bd. 23). Frauenfeld, Huber. 8 Fr. 50.
- SATORI-NEUMANN, B., Dreihundert Jahre berufsständisches Theater in Elbing. Die Geschichte einer ostdeutschen Provinzialbühne. Bd. 1, 1605-1846. (Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte Westpreussens, 20.) Danzig, Verlagsgesell. in Komm. 10 M. 50.
- Scheffel, J. V. von, Eine Studienfreundschaft. Scheffels Briefe an Friedrich Eggers 1844/9... Hrsg. von G. Ruge. (Gabe des deutschen Scheffelbundes an seine Mitglieder, 12.) Karlsruhe, Dt. Scheffelbund.
- SCHNEIBENBERGER, K., Der Einfluss der Bibel und des Kirchenliedes auf die Lyrik der deutschen Befreiungskriege. Gelnhausen, Kalbfleisch.
- SCHERER, C., Zum Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Johannes Müller. Bamberg, Buchners Verlag. 3 M.
- SCHNEURLEN, P., Paul Gerhardt, der Sänger und Bekenner (Führer und Freunde, Bd. 18). Berlin, Acker-Verlag. 0 M. 60.
- SCHRODER, H., Nietzsche und das Christentum. Berlin-Lichterfelde, Widukind-Verlag. 2 M.
- SCHUTTERLE, P., Der Heimatroman in der deutschen Presse der Nachkriegszeit. Würzburg, Mayr.
- SCHUTZ, W. von, Biographische Notizen über Heinrich von Kleist (Schriften der Kleistgesellschaft, Bd. 16). Berlin, Weidmann. 4 M.
- SCHWARZ, O., Das Recht in den sozialen Dramen, erläutert am Arbeitsvertrag. Erlangen, Hofer.
- SENGLE, F., Goethes Verhältnis zum Drama. Die theoretischen Bemerkungen in Zusammenhang mit seinem dramatischen Schaffen. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte, Bd. 9.) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 5 M. 80.
- SEUFFERT, T. von, Venedig im Erlebnis deutscher Dichter (Italienische Studien, 2). Köln, Petrarca-Haus. 3 M. 60.
- STAIGER, E., Der Geist der Liebe und das Schicksal. Schelling, Hegel und Hölderlin. Frauenfeld, Huber.
- STAMM, A., Die Gestalt des deutschschweizerischen Dichters um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Wege zur Dichtung, Bd. 26). Frauenfeld, Huber. 6 Fr.

- STEINDECKER, W., Studien zum Motiv des einsamen Menschen bei Novalis und Tieck (Sprache und Kultur der german. und roman. Völker, Reihe B, Bd. 19). Breslau, Priebatsch's Buchhandlung. 3 M. 60.
- STRASSER, R., Stilprobleme in Gessners Kunst und Dichtung. Berlin, Brandenb. Buchdr. und Verl. Anst.
- TAUSEND, H., Das Problem der Wissenschaft bei Nietzsche (Universitätsarchiv, Philos. Abt., Bd. 10). Münster, Buschmann. 3 M. 20.
- Theater der Welt. Zeitschrift für die gesamte Theaterkultur. Geleitet von J. Gregor. Jg. 1. Wien, Leo und Comp. Jährlich 20 M. Einzelh. 2 M.
- THIERGARTNER, H., Der Romanschriftsteller Richard Voss und sein Italien-erlebnis. Ochsenfurt a.M., Fritz und Rappert.
- TRABERT, M., Friedrich Schlegels Weg von der romantischen zur christlichen Anthropologie. Teildr.: Wiesbaden, Matthias-Grunewald-Druckerei.
- TRAUTZ, F., Schiller-Thunberg-Siebold. Kyoto, Trautz.
- WALZEL, O., Florenz in deutscher Dichtung (Veröffentlichungen des Petrarca-Hauses, Reihe 1, 3). Köln, Petrarca-Haus. 1 M. 80.
- WEBER, C., Heinrich Lersch. Dichter und Arbeiter. Freiburg i. Br., Schmied. 6 M. 90.
- WEHRLI, M., Johann Jakob Bodmer und die Geschichte der Literatur (Wege zur Dichtung, Bd. 27). 6 Fr.
- WEIRICH, R., Schillers Auffassung von der Kunst als einer erziehenden Macht und ihre Bedeutung für die französische Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts. Würzburg, Mayr.
- WEZEL, E., Otto Heuschele. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der jüngeren schwäbischen Dichtung. Stuttgart, Strecker und Schröder. 2 M.
- WINGENROTH, S., Clara Viebig und der Frauenroman des deutschen Naturalismus. Endingen a. K., Wild.
- WITTIG, L., Der junge Friedrich Hebbel als Gestalter seines Selbst (Germanische Studien, H. 188). Berlin, Ebering. 4 M. 80.
- WITTMANN, F., Der Arzt im Spiegelbild der deutschen schönggeistigen Literatur seit dem Beginn des Naturalismus (Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften, H. 18). Berlin, Ebering. 5 M. 40.
- WOLF, W., Rainer Maria Rilkes Duineser Elegien. Eine Textdeutung. Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M. 50.
- WULFRATH, K., Bibliotheca Marchica. Die Literatur der westfälischen Mark, Teil 1. (Veröffentlichungen der hist. Kommission des Provinzialinstituts für westfälische Landes- und Volkskunde, 21.) Münster, Aschendorff. 9 M.

EDITORIAL NOTE

Work has begun upon the Index to Vols. xxi-xxx of the *Modern Language Review*, and it is hoped to distribute it as a separate fascicle with the number for January 1938.

C. J. Sisson.

MILTON'S SCHOOLMASTERS

SINGULARLY little attention has been paid to the works of the men who must have exerted a profound influence upon Milton's mind at its most impressionable period, Thomas Young, his private tutor, and Alexander Gill, headmaster of St Paul's School. Their connexion with Milton is duly noted by every biographer of the poet, and what is known of their lives can be recorded in a page or two;¹ but there is apparently little attraction in a treatise on the Lord's Day, a sermon, a series of pamphlets on the church, an English grammar in Latin, and a work on the Creed. What they tell us is, however, interesting with regard to Milton and, to some extent, interesting in itself.

I

Of the two, it was Young for whom Milton had more esteem and with whom, at first, he was more obviously in sympathy; but this intimacy could not have continued for very long after the overthrow of episcopacy, since Young's career followed a course which did not have Milton's approval.² And Milton himself began very soon to express opinions with

¹ The chief facts of Young's life are given in David Laing, *Biographical Notices of Thomas Young*, 1870; of Gill's, in Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* and Aubrey's *Lives*. The accounts in the *Dictionary of National Biography* are fairly complete; see also Masson, I, 68-84.

² Young, the son of a Scotch Presbyterian minister, was probably the Thomas Young appointed in 1614 to Resolis in Ross (*Fasts Ecclesiae Scoticae*, vii, p. 18). He appears to have become Milton's tutor about 1618 (Aubrey, *Early Lives of Milton*, ed. Darbishire, p. 2); but Masson was wrong in supposing that he continued so until he went to Hamburg in 1622 as chaplain to the English merchants. As a result of the kind suggestions of Professor Sir Herbert Grierson, I find that Young must have gone to Hamburg in 1620, the year in which Milton entered St Paul's School. The chaplaincy fell vacant in June, 1620, when John Wing removed to Flushing (*Fasts Ecclesiae Scoticae*, vii, p. 545); and in a letter dated 24 March, 1620/21, and included in Birch's *Court and Times of James I* (1848, II, p. 240) Joseph Mede mentions Young as having returned to England from Hamburg. In a letter dated 7 July, 1621, Mede again mentions Young as being 'at Cambridge this commencement' (Birch, II, p. 266).

In a letter addressed to Young at Hamburg (26 March 1625), Milton expresses 'unparalleled and matchless gratitude' for his goodness, while in *Elegia quarta* (1627) he notes that Young first introduced him to the delights of the classics and of composition (ll. 29-32), comments on his learning (ll. 43-4), and, in deploring his unprosperous condition, uses him (as later he was to use King) for an excuse to remark on the lamentable state of the church (ll. 83-102). In 1628, Young became vicar of Stowmarket, a parish he retained till his death in 1655, and in a second letter (21 July 1628), Milton accepts an invitation to visit him and enlarges on his temperance. Perhaps as a result of his share in the Smectymnuan pamphlets, Young was appointed to the Westminster Assembly and was also given the parish of St James, Duke Place. Laing does not notice that, along with other members of the Assembly, he signed *Certain Considerations to Dissuade Men from further gathering of Churches in this present juncture of time*. . . 1643, an admonition directed chiefly against the Independents and Sectaries; and also *The Humble Advice of the Assembly*

which Young, as a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, found it impossible to agree.¹ Nevertheless, it is not too much to assume that it was chiefly to Young that Milton owed his inclination towards Puritanism and his introduction to principles from which he was never to depart. The equipment of ideas with which Milton launched forth upon his controversial career is, in fact, essentially that of Young, though the divergence in interpretation which was at length to lead him to a position quite opposed to Young's is already vaguely apparent in the early pamphlets. A brief comparison of the opinions expressed in Young's published works with those expressed in Milton's will make these facts clear.

Young's first and chief work, *Dies Dominica, sive succincta narratio ex S. Scripturarum & venerandae antiquitatis Patrum testimoniis concinnata* . . . , was first published pseudonymously in 1639, and appeared in English in 1672 as *The Lord's Day* . . . This edition, from which I quote, had a preface by Baxter, in which he enlarges upon Young's virtues—'a man eminent in his time for great learning, judgment, piety, humility'—and commends the book highly as of great use at a time when, in spite of the commands of men, true Christians ought to strive to observe the day strictly.

It is unnecessary to analyse here the laborious and heavily buttressed argument by which Young goes about to show, first, that the Lord's Day is properly to be observed in place of the Jewish Sabbath as being the day on which Christ rose from the tomb, and, secondly, to what occupations it ought and ought not to be devoted. His attitude is that of orthodox Puritanism. He is convinced that hitherto 'this festival hath been

of Divines...concerning a Confession of Faith, presented by them lately to both Houses of Parliament...1646. He became master of Jesus College, Cambridge, in 1644, as a result of Manchester's visitation; but he was removed in 1650 because of his refusal to take the Engagement. Laing remarks that he is said to have had a hand in *The Humble Proposals of Sundry Learned and Pious Divines...concerning the Engagement...1650*, a brief plea of conscience against the new oath as a violation of the Covenant. It expresses what must have been his views, but there is no evidence as to the part he took, if any, in its composition. Upon his ejection, he appears to have retired to Stowmarket.

It is not unlikely that Milton had his tutor in mind when he commented, in *The History of Britain*, upon the apostasy of the members of the Assembly who, though in receipt of a public salary, were not unwilling to accept '(besides one, sometimes two or more of the best livings) collegiate masterships in the universities, rich lectures in the city, setting sail to all winds that might blow gain into their covetous bosoms' (*Prose Works*, Bohn—subsequently referred to as *P.W.*—v, 238).

¹ The framers of *The Humble Advice of the Assembly of Divines* probably had Milton's arguments in mind when they wrote the following passage: 'Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage, yet nothing but adultery, or such wilful desertion as can no way be remedied by the church or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage; wherein a public and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed, and the persons concerned in it not left to their own wills and discretion in their own case' (*The Humble Advice*, p. 41).

solemnised as was fit, in the exercise of piety according to the rule of God's word, but by few; which the many fairs upon it for gainful labour, in all nations, feasts, drunkenness, dancings, and the impious profanations of it by stage-plays do testify'.¹ After proving his first assertion from scripture, from the analogy with the law of the Sabbath, and from patristic writings, he concludes his first book with a discussion of those activities of 'profaneness and carnal delight' which are improper, including, with those mentioned above, sports of all kinds, pageants, and 'immodest interludes'.² His second book is devoted to those exercises which are proper: church services, sermons, prayers, singing of psalms and hymns, gathering of alms, and private searching of the scripture.

These opinions concerning the Lord's Day are echoed by the Milton of 1641 at least; for, in his first pamphlet, he expresses a characteristically individual and somewhat exaggerated view of the notorious Book of Sports, regarding it as part of a design of the prelates—the subtlety of which, whatever their other machinations, was probably beyond them—to imitate that which Cyrus practised upon the Lydians, when, in order to make them slaves, he made them effeminate.³ However, if in 1641 Milton agreed substantially with Young in his attitude towards 'that day which God's law and our own reason hath consecrated', his opinions on this, as on many other questions, suffered a great change in the twenty busy years which separated his vigorous, though not very constructive, attack on episcopacy from the composition of his own theological work. In his discussion of Sunday and the Sabbath in *De Doctrina Christiana*, he might well be attacking Young's very arguments, though this does not actually appear to be the case. There, after dismissing the scriptural evidence for the observation of the Lord's Day and the false analogy with the Sabbath law, he asserts that no divine commandment for the observation of a day of worship exists under the Gospel, and that such a day is only to be kept voluntarily and on the authority of the church.⁴

This attitude towards the Lord's Day is symptomatic of Milton's general view of the freedom of the Christian, a view arrived at only through the painful labours of the controversial prose. With all the elements which contributed to the development of this opinion, we are not here concerned; but Young's own arguments throw light upon some of them.

¹ Dedication *To the Holy Orthodox Church of Christ*: unpagged. In quoting throughout the article, I modernize the spelling.

² Chapters XI–XIV.

³ *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 401–2. He has the same idea in mind when he advises the magistrate to take into his care 'the managing of our sports and festival pastimes' (*Reason of Church Government*, P.W., II, 480).

⁴ P.W., v, 64–74.

As his title suggests, Young based his reasoning with regard to the Lord's Day, not merely on the meagre authority derivable from the recorded observances of the apostles in the *Acts*, but also upon the testimony of 'the reverend, ancient fathers'. He was, indeed, noted in his own day for his patristic learning. Baxter speaks of him in his preface as eminent 'especially for his acquaintance with the writings of the ancient teachers of the churches and the doctrines and practices of former ages'.¹ This familiarity stood him in good stead in his first treatise, and the reader will note the contrast between his attempt to defend the Lord's Day 'both with the authority of scripture and likewise with the consent and records of reverend antiquity plainly attested',² and the attitude of his former pupil to 'that indigested heap and fry of authors'.³ In a passage at the beginning of his treatise, Young sets forth clearly the authorities on which he depends and points to a manner of settling controverted points which Milton was before long to find very unsound:

'The church of Christ in old time appealed to the scriptures, councils, and records of the ancients in deciding of questions whereby the peace of the church was disturbed or course of the gospel retarded; and then the ancients did interpret the scriptures, not as they were by the crooked interpretations of sectaries and heretics, accommodated to their own dreams, but according to the analogy of faith, by the consent of other scriptures. In the church there hath always been great profit by and very much need of councils; and, in conclusion, if ill-employed men had rejected the records of the ancients, they were forthwith exploded by the church.'⁴

It is not, he goes on, 'that I ascribe more to antiquity than truth, for that I leave to the Papists'; nor does he run 'unweaponed, that is, deprived of spiritual knowledge revealed in God's word, to the ancients'; but he considers scripture vague with regard to the Lord's Day, and 'I therefore consult the ancients, who faithfully retain what they received from the Lord by the Apostles, that their pious opinion and practice being observed, we may observe likewise what we are to do in this case'.⁵ Young would limit the authority of the fathers to traditions which have at least some ground in scripture; but, with the caution characteristic of the mediaeval thinker, he claims to have 'affirmed nothing without the perspicuous testimony of notable authority'. The question of the reverence due to authority, which perplexed Sir Thomas Browne in

¹ 'Epistle to the Reader.' Milton remarks (*Elegia quarta*, ll. 43-4) that his poem may find Young with his children, 'Forsthan aut veterum praelarga volumina Patrum Versantum, aut veri Biblia sacra Dei'.

² Dedication.

³ *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, P.W., II, 422.

⁴ Dedication.

⁵ 'Since nothing can with faithfulness be brought to light out of the pleasant gardens of the ancients against which malevolous detractors do not whet their tongues', Young supplies a table of the editions 'of the fathers and other writers' to whom he refers. It is interesting to notice that the long list includes the *Medulla Theologica* of 'learned Ames, of pious memory', one of the works upon which Milton is said by Edward Phillips to have based his theological treatise; see *Early Lives of Milton*, ed. Darbishire, p. 61.

another connexion,¹ and which scarcely at all perplexed William Prynne, who 'littered and overlaid' his margin 'with crude and huddled quotations';² is solved for Young by the assumption that reason and the consent of all good men must support each other:

Whatever my bleare eyes have observed to be laid up in the deep records of honourable antiquity (which they that love the truth cannot but highly prize) upon this holy subject, I have brought it out to light, that it may be manifested to all who truly favour of godliness how much honour, not only reason itself, but the consent of all good men and learned do attribute to so solemn a festival.³

Milton probably owed much of his patristic learning to Young's direction; yet, even in those pamphlets in which he is writing as the ally of Smectymnuus and largely as the pupil of Young,⁴ his censure of those who elect to depend upon the authority of fathers and councils is unreserved. This rejection of 'uncertain and unsound tradition', on the ground that the times, the men, and their writings were corrupt,⁵ does not, however, indicate a revolt against the position of Young and of orthodox Puritanism. Large sections of the Smectymnuan pamphlets are occupied with the refutation of patristic authorities brought forward by Bishop Hall and by the production of other testimonies supporting the Puritan contentions;⁶ but the Smectymnuans are clear on the fundamental principle of Puritanism. They prefer to depend upon what is for them the clear and unequivocal authority of scripture; for 'one grain of scripture is of more efficacy and esteem to faith than whole volumes of human testimonies'.⁷ 'If this Remonstrant think to help himself by taking sanctuary in antiquity', they are ready to disprove his arguments; but they 'would gladly rest in scripture, the sanctuary of the Lord...'.⁸ Similarly, that eminent Scotch divine, Robert Baillie, argued that 'we must not take our rule and pattern from ancient and primitive times, but from the first times..., because many of the fathers did unwittingly bring forth that Antichrist which was conceived in the time of the apostles, and therefore are incompetent judges in the question of hierarchy...'.⁹

¹ *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, I, chaps. 6-9.

² *Colasterion*, P.W., III, 435.

³ *The Lord's Day*, p. 408.

⁴ Whether one agrees with Masson (II, 244) and W. T. Hale (*Of Reformation*, liii) that Milton did, or with Mr G. W. Whiting (*M.L.R.*, xxx, pp. 13-18) that Milton did not assist the Smectymnuans in the composition of the historical Postscript to their *Answer* to Hall's *Humble Remonstrance*, there can be no doubt of his close association with them. He entered the controversy with Hall directly, of course, in his *Animadversions and Apology*; but much of *Of Reformation* will be found upon close study to echo their arguments, and it seems likely that the 'friend' to whom the pamphlet is addressed was Thomas Young. That he was a clergyman is clear from a passage at the beginning of Milton's concluding prayer (*P.W.*, III, 417).

⁵ *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 378 ff.

⁶ *An Answer to a book entitled An Humble Remonstrance*, 1641, sections II, IV-VIII, etc.; *A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance*, sections IV ff.

⁷ *An Answer*, p. 114.

⁸ *Ib.*, p. 23.

⁹ *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacie*, 1641, p. 7.

Milton's attack upon authority in *Of Reformation* is simply an elaboration of this view; for he fully accepts the assumption that an immutable form of church government is laid down in scripture. When, like the Smectymnuans, he quotes Cyprian's famous sentence—that 'custom without truth is but agedness of error'—it is this divine institution which he has in mind.¹ What he demands is the 'constitution of the one right discipline', the 'church government that is appointed in the gospel'.² Such a demand is the negation of Hooker's rationalistic view of ecclesiastical polity, and involves, in fact, a condemnation of those who prefer, 'before the ordinance of God', the 'rare device of man's brain'.³ To the 'weak mightiness of man's reasoning', Milton opposes 'the mighty weakness of the gospel'.⁴ The argument was effective in controversy with those who defended episcopacy by an appeal to tradition, even when, like Hall, they claimed for it a 'divine right'; but the heavy emphasis upon 'the gross distorted apprehension of decayed mankind' in the early pamphlets⁵ comes a little strangely from the author of the *Areopagitica*. Like so much more in these tracts, it is, however, merely Milton's version of an opinion expressed by Young; and it may be observed that, in spite of his rejection of the decisions of past councils, he echoes Young's remark that 'in the church there hath always been great profit and very much need of councils'. This, and not the methods in use among the bishops, was 'the way which the apostles used' to preserve the unity of the church.⁶ The actions of the Westminster Assembly were to cause him somewhat to modify his opinion.

Yet in Milton's reply to Hall's argument from the decisions of the councils concerning the liturgy, there appears a kind of assertion which is not prominent in the writings of Young; 'I shall be bold to say that reason is the gift of God in one man, as well as in a thousand. . .'.⁷ Such appeals do not occur often in the anti-episcopal tracts, for Milton is concerned to demonstrate rather the limitations than the prerogatives of the human reason; but they nevertheless point to the path along which he is to diverge from Young and his like. Milton is yet to take that path; but such references as these serve to remind one of the humanistic element in his education. The doctrine of the sufficiency of the reason, derived in part, perhaps, from Alexander Gill, is present in his mind.

¹ *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 384-5. The two passages here given by Milton in translation were quoted by the Smectymnuans in Latin (*An Answer*, p. 19).

² *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 412, 392.

³ *The Reason of Church Government*, P.W., II, 460. For Hooker on the rejection of tradition, see *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*, Preface, iv.

⁴ *Ib.*, P.W., II, 485.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 441.

⁶ *Ib.*, p. 464.

⁷ *Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defence*, P.W., III, 57.

The corrosive effect upon ecclesiastical and political institutions of that idea as popularised by the pamphleteers of the time—by the Lilburnes and Overtons, on the one hand, and the Goodwins and Miltons, on the other—is well known; and so far as Milton personally is concerned, it will eventually lead him from the real sympathy with Young apparent in the early pamphlets to the pronouncements of *De Doctrina Christiana*. That, combined with an extreme interpretation of the doctrine of Christian liberty, an interpretation almost, though not quite, Antinomian, is to work a transformation of his opinions on subjects more fundamental than that of the Lord's Day.¹

Milton's conviction as to the power of the individual reason—especially in regenerate man, living in that 'age of ages wherein God is manifestly come down among us to do some remarkable good to our church and state'²—and his doctrine of the necessary freedom of the individual Christian from all external constraint, will only begin to receive reasoned expression in the divorce pamphlets and in *Areopagitica*. In these writings, the divergence from Young becomes sharp; for here, and with regard to two matters in which (according to Milton) there is no absolute command of God, he positively rejects the method of decision adopted by Young in *Dies Dominica* in favour of 'free reasoning' and 'the liberty of the gospel'.³ The freedom demanded at this point is only a freedom in 'indifferent things', in things 'uncertainly working to good or evil', wherein 'truth may be on this side or the other, without being unlike herself'.⁴ But the process is under way.

Yet, if the assertions of these pamphlets may be traced back to those on the church, these again may be traced back to Young; for, in spite of his reverence for authority, his orthodoxy, and his impatience with 'the crooked interpretations of sectaries and heretics', Young is not unsympathetic to the essential convictions of the *Areopagitica*. 'Men of every age, studiously following after the known truth . . . are blessed with a new light of knowledge not observed by their predecessors. It sometimes also falleth out that some things may be revealed to men of inferior condition, which are hid to others of greater name and authority'.⁵

Christian liberty remained for Young, as for orthodox Puritanism, a

¹ For a brief exposition of the doctrine of Christian liberty in Milton and other Puritans, see *Puritanism and Liberty and Milton, Puritanism and Liberty*, by Professor A. S. P. Woodhouse (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, IV (1935)).

² *Animadversions*, P.W., III, 69.

³ *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, P.W., III, 172, 228.

⁴ *Areopagitica*, P.W., II, p. 97.

⁵ *The Lord's Day*, p. 15. Young uses as an example the opposition of Paphnutius to the Council of Nice on the question of the celibacy of the clergy, an example which Milton quoted against Hall in the passage referred to above (*Animadversions*, P.W., III, 57).

theological concept expressive of a purely spiritual condition, a privilege which, as Calvin said, did not require for its perfection to be 'used in the presence of men'.¹ In Milton's early pamphlets, on the other hand, it is already associated with the rights of lay believers, with 'those many admirable and heavenly privileges reached out to us by the gospel', in which he found the satisfaction of his own egoism.² Again, however, much of what he has to say of the place of the individual layman in church government is an echo of the Smectymnuan assertions. The account in *Of Reformation* of the part played by the people in primitive elections is a repetition, not merely of the arguments, but of much of the material used by them;³ the description, in *The Reason of Church Government*, of true church censure as exercised by the congregation is similarly parallel to their account;⁴ while in their discussion of 'the joint power of the seniors, with the clergy, in ordering ecclesiastical affairs', the function of Milton's 'certain number of grave and faithful brethren' is fully described.⁵ Even Milton's attack upon the corruptions which he regards as the product of episcopacy is anticipated by the Smectymnuans: 'when the ministry came to have *agros, domos, locationes, vehicula, equos, latifundia*, as Chrysost. *Hom. 86 in Matth.* . . . , then religion *perperit divitias et filia devoravit matrem* . . . ; and then there was a voice of angels heard from heaven, *Hodie venenum in ecclesiam Christi cecidit* Then also was that conjunction found true; that when they had wooden chalices, they had golden priests, but when the chalices were golden, their priests were wooden.'⁶

Yet the Smectymnuans were Puritan clergymen; and, as Milton was shortly to find, there was some truth in Sir Thomas Aston's assertion that 'they have no thought of the people's liberty, but to assume into their own hands the same power they cry down in the bishops . . .'.⁷ In a dispute which was chiefly between two groups of the clergy, Young does not

¹ *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (trans. Beveridge), 1875, p. 135. For an orthodox presentation of the doctrine, based upon Calvin, see *The Humble Advice of the Assembly*, pp. 32-3. Young points out that the appointment of a certain day for worship 'neither diminisheth nor abolisheth Christian liberty, but merely indicates the right use of it' (*The Lord's Day*, p. 158).

² *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 365.

³ Compare *An Answer*, pp. 33-4, and *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 376-7. Milton was not alone in making use of the Smectymnuan arguments. Lord Brooke not only took the arguments for section II, chapter I, of his *Discourse Opening the Nature of Episcopacy* from Milton's *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, as has recently been pointed out (G. W. Whiting, *M.L.N.*, LI (1936), 161-6); but also borrowed the arguments for his next three chapters almost wholly, and sometimes bodily, from the Smectymnuan *Answer*, sections VII-XII, and probably made use of the historical Postscript (*Discourse*, I, viii; *An Answer*, pp. 86-104).

⁴ *An Answer*, pp. 41 ff., and *The Reason of Church Government*, P.W., II, 492 ff.

⁵ *An Answer*, p. 73, and *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 416-7.

⁶ *An Answer*, p. 63.

⁷ *A Remonstrance against Presbitery*, 1641, section VIII, unpagcd.

forget the dignities which belong to his order; and one slight disagreement between his opinions and Milton's may serve to indicate the difference in emphasis which is to lead them in different directions.

For Young and the Smectymnuans, the first Christian emperor is 'blessed Constantine', 'pious, religious Constantine', 'admired Constantine, that great promover and patron of the peace of the Christian church', the 'great and most godly emperor', who 'contended by all means that he could to promote our religion'.¹ For Milton, he is the symbol of corruption and worldly Antichristianism; and Milton's attack upon Constantine and those who praise his example has an ominous ring. 'They extol Constantine because he extolled them. . . . If he had curbed the growing pride, avarice, and luxury of the clergy, then every page of his story should have swelled with his faults. . . .'² Here already there are signs of that tendency by which Milton was to become, not merely anti-episcopal, but anti-clerical. The disgust with an inefficient clergy expressed in *Elegia quarta* and *Lycidas*, associated now with a conviction of the dignity of the laity, 'the people of God, redeemed and washed with Christ's blood', and in their own right prophets, priests and kings,³ is to grow through a hatred of episcopacy and then of presbytery to a reaction against the whole order, to the attack upon the clergy in the tract on hirelings and to the pronouncement of *De Doctrina Christiana* that even the sacraments are not the monopoly of an ordained ministry.⁴ And of priestly corruption, as Milton sees it, the career of Thomas Young will afford an example.

Nevertheless, in 1642 and 1643 Young must still have been Milton's revered friend; and Milton must have read with appreciation (if he did not hear it) the sermon which Young preached before the House of Commons at their fast on 28 February 1644, and published by their order almost immediately, with the title *Hope's Encouragement*. It was one of those hortatory appeals to further the work of reformation which the monthly fasts allowed the clergy to make to parliament, and, through the welter of quotations from the fathers and examples of God's assistance to the hopeful in the Old Testament, there appears a conviction of divine support and direction very like Milton's own, and, moreover, something of the sense of inescapable destiny which moved the poet to embark on the 'troubled sea of noises and hoarse disputes'. Sentences such as this

¹ *An Answer*, pp. 28, 35; *The Lord's Day*, Preface, and p. 58.

² *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 380

³ *Ib.*, P.W., II, 377.

⁴ *De Doctrina Christiana*, P.W., IV, 418.

reveal, more clearly than arguments from antiquity, the spirit of the man who had a part in moulding Milton's mind:

... (When God calls a man to any work, he must not forbear or keep off from doing that which God calls him to, upon fear of what may ensue; but rouse up his spirit and strive to fulfil his work. Therein will appear his courage, in breaking through all difficulties whatsoever, to honour God in obedience to his command.¹

And, indeed, whatever the principles Milton was then evolving, the spirit of the whole sermon is like his own, and its rhetoric reminds one of his own impassioned appeals to parliament.

The work you are called to is a work of great concernment; it is the purging of the Lord's floor, as it hath reference both to church and commonwealth. A work sure enough to be encountered with great oppositions; yet, I must say, it is a work with the managing whereof God hath not so honoured others which have gone before you in your places, but hath reserved it to make you the instruments of his glory in advancing it; and that doth much add unto your honour. Was it an honour to the Tyrians that they were counted amongst the builders of the temple, when Hiram sent to Solomon things necessary for that work? How then hath God honoured you, reserving to you the care of reedifying of his church (the house of the living God) and the repairing of the shattered commonwealth (so far borne down before he raised you up to support it) that succeeding ages may with honour to your names say, 'This was the Reforming Parliament'?²

The authentic voice of Puritan zeal speaks here, and it is a voice which speaks no less certainly in Milton's pages.

II

Milton was at St Paul's School under Alexander Gill from 1620 to 1625, and, though he makes no reference to Gill or the school, one can be sure that they made an impression on his mind.³ It is usually assumed that the influence of Gill himself was chiefly literary, the result of that regard for English poetry which appears in his *Logonomia Anglica*.⁴ In the attitude towards English there expressed, we have perhaps the original though not of course the only source of Milton's decision against Latin and in favour of English, recorded in the *Vacation Exercise* and *Mansus*. With his desire for a pure Anglo-Saxon speech and his dislike of Chaucer's use of French and Latin words,⁵ Gill might have been critical of *Paradise*

¹ *Hope's Encouragement*, p. 13.

² *Ib.*, p. 26.

³ Three of Milton's extant letters are addressed to Gill's son, Alexander Gill the younger, but no mention is made of the father. Milton was evidently much less intimately associated with Gill than with Young. In what follows I do not attempt to treat Gill as a specific source of Milton's ideas but merely to indicate the character of the mind which must, as will be seen from the discussion, have contributed something to the point of view with which Milton entered Cambridge. For a brief account of the school and an attempt to show the influence on Milton's work of the books he studied there, see A. F. Leach, *Milton as Schoolboy and Schoolmaster, Proceedings of the British Academy*, III, 1908.

⁴ *Logonomia Anglica, qua gentis sermo facilius addiscitur*; first published in 1619. I refer to the second edition, 1621.

⁵ 'To the Reader.' Gill wished even to reintroduce Anglo-Saxon letters. His account of the development of the language indicates an interest in early British and English history which may have contributed to Milton's.

Lost; but he would have commended the effort to equal in English the achievements of Greek, Latin and Italian. If Young introduced Milton to the delights of the classic languages, Gill directed him towards those of English; and Milton must frequently have listened to the sentiments expressed in the dedication of the *Logonomia* to James I, who is reminded of the care which princes have ever had for the languages of their countries.

O si tanti principis curae par populi amor respondisset! certe nec juris consulti illa nomini Anglico inusta servitutis stigmata in hodiernum usque diem ostentarent; nec ab aliis gentibus male audiret (ut barbara) lingua Anglica, qua nulla, audeo dicere nulla earum quae nunc mortalibus in usu sunt, aut cultior, aut ornatio, aut ad omnia animi sensa explicanda aptior, aut facundior invenietur.

The 'mighty-mouth'd inventor of harmonies' must have been interested, too, in Gill's discussion of prosody and the adaptability of classical metres to English, and also in his lengthy account of poetical figures. It is in the quotations illustrating these subjects that Gill shows his wide knowledge of English poetry.¹

There is, however, another respect in which Gill must have exerted a profound directive influence on Milton's mind, an influence which may have put him, at the outset, in a way of thought which he maintained and extended throughout his life. For, if, so far as Milton is concerned, Young is representative of the tradition of Puritanism, Gill is a representative, and no mean one, of the tradition of Protestant rationalism.

The *Logonomia* is not, in fact, Gill's most important work, nor does it express his deepest convictions. Those are to be found in his *Sacred Philosophy of the Holy Scripture, laid down as conclusions upon the Articles of our faith, commonly called the Apostles Creed, proved by the principles and rules taught and received in the light of understanding*.² Far more than the little text-book, this folio volume serves to reveal Gill's personality and to indicate the cast of his mind. It places him in the great tradition of seventeenth-century Anglican theology which comes down from Hooker, and it perhaps indicates the original source of that element in Milton's thought which reminds one of the Cambridge Platonists.

Gill remarks that he 'had long thought on this work', and it appears to have taken shape in his mind as a result of the short *Treatise Concerning the Trinity* which he wrote at Norwich in 1597, for the use of one Thomas Mannering, an Anabaptist, 'that by himself, if God would, he might consider and be persuaded'.³ Since then, he had 'for mine own use

¹ *Logonomia*, chaps. 19-28. Gill quotes from many of the English poets; but he prefers Sidney and, above all, Spenser, the latter in some respects even to Homer.

² The work had two editions: one in 1635, to which I refer, and the other in 1651.

³ First published in 1601, and reprinted with the *Sacred Philosophy*.

gathered divers notes and arguments thereunto', but he refrained from composing his book, partly because, 'for my profession's sake, I was compelled to poets and their fables, and among children, to speak to their understanding', partly because of his advancing years, but chiefly because he hoped that someone better fitted would engage in the task.¹ That hope seeming not to be fulfilled, he at last turned to his composition, just as Milton was entering Cambridge, 'when that great and grievous pestilence which befell in the year 1625, had made a stop to that daily toil'. His personality is perhaps most clearly revealed in his sudden and unexpected apology in the preface for appearing, aged and unheralded, in the war against atheism, in spite of a sense of his deficiencies; for 'though I have stood all day in the market because no man hath hired me, yet seeing I would as fain have the penny as he that hath borne the burden and heat of the day, I would not be idle', and 'although it be not lawful for me to handle either sword or spear, yet, because I wish well to these holy wars, I have as a straggler brought my basket of stones, whence the cunning slingers, our Davids, if they please, may choose what they like, if any uncircumcised Philistine shall defy the host of Israel'.²

It is not possible to embark here on an analysis of the manner in which Gill expounds each article of the Creed, though his exposition is worth the attention of students of Milton. What is of interest at this time is the defence of his method of asserting the truth of Christian beliefs. In the body of his treatise, he is not concerned with controversies among Christians (though, as we shall see, heresy finds a place in his notes), but with showing that the doctrines common to orthodox believers have not merely the support of reason, but are the logical consequences of reasoning on the state of things. For the specific purpose of his work is to convince, on the one hand, those atheists, Jews and Turks who do not admit the force of divine revelation, and, on the other, 'the novice in Christianity, who therefore doubts of the trueness of his religion because he finds no familiar reason to persuade, but only the rack of authorities to constrain him to acknowledge it'.³

He does not assume that, for the Christian, reason can really be substituted for scripture and revelation. He himself has first arrived by faith at a conviction of the truth of Christian doctrines and then proceeded to

¹ The pagination of the *Sacred Philosophy* makes reference difficult. The 'Preface to the Reader' is unpaginated and without signatures. I have therefore supplied it with numbers, to which I refer in brackets. Though the treatise is not divided into parts, the numbering of the pages begins anew with Article III of the Creed, and continues to include the 'Conclusion and the *Treatise on the Trinity*'. I refer to the first series as '(i)', and to the second as '(ii)'. The present reference is thus (ii), 207.

² 'Preface', (12), (10).

³ *The Trinity*, (ii), 211.

show them to be necessarily true even by reason. 'I examine not these things as the Bereans did; but knowing, acknowledging, and to the death holding them true, I bring all the strength of my understanding to approve them so.'¹ But for the purpose of his treatise, the process has, as it were, to be reversed, since those who have not faith and who do not accept the scriptures must be brought to believe through the force of reason and on grounds acceptable to them as men. Hence, 'my purpose is to add an overplus of proof to the persuasion which the Christian hath, and to justify his faith against all adversaries, not by the authority of scripture only, which with heretics, Turks and Infidels is of small regard'.² The importance of Gill's book is that, as a consequence of his purpose, he thus elects for the moment to set aside even the scriptures, which are the foundation of faith, and to rest his case upon reason and nature, fully confident that, without the support of scripture and authority, the fundamental Christian beliefs must be found true because reasonable.

He is attempting, in a more limited manner, a task not unlike that attempted by Cudworth in his *True Intellectual System of the Universe*, and his place in the history of Christian rationalism can be understood by comparing his work with two treatises written at almost the same time. Herbert of Cherbury composed his *De Veritate* about 1622; Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants* appeared in 1638. Both are regarded as landmarks in the development towards the rationalism of the eighteenth century, and Gill's work occupies a significant position midway between them; for while personally accepting Chillingworth's standards, he purposely adopts criteria similar to Herbert's. The situation would be one of beautiful regularity if Chillingworth had written first, to be followed by Gill and then Herbert; but, unfortunately, it is even impossible to assert that Gill owed anything to Herbert, or Chillingworth to Gill.³

Nevertheless, Gill's mediation between the two will become apparent from an account of the position he adopts in the *Sacred Philosophy*, and in this connexion the group of writers he claims to have taken as models is significant, for it includes the great Christian apologists and the pioneers in natural religion. He is moved to refer to them in order to indicate the manner in which he finds each unsatisfactory. First, of course, comes Aquinas, whose deficiency is his moving an endless number of questions; next, Raymundus de Sabunde (whose *Theologia naturalis*

¹ 'Preface', (10).

² (II), 68.

³ There are no references, and any similarities in phrasing are too vague to be taken as reminiscences. With regard to Herbert one may note the suggestive fact recorded in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (Herbert, ix, 630), on what authority I do not know, that he sent a copy of *De Veritate* to Gassendi, by Milton's school friend, Diodati.

was translated by Montaigne), who is 'easy and quick', but lacking in the method Gill desires; then Savonarola, who like all Schoolmen omits much that is necessary and includes much that is not;¹ after him, Philippe de Mornay (whose *De la Vérité de la religion Chrestienne* was partly translated by Sidney), who depends upon scripture in a manner unsuitable to Gill's purpose; and finally Ramon Lull ('Raymund Lulli'), whose method 'gives more full satisfaction', but who 'proposeth his reasons with great confusion'.² This group illustrates Gill's intellectual affinities, and it both prepares one for his spirited defence of reason and suggests the atmosphere in which Milton's education was conducted.

Gill's lengthy justification of rationalism results partly from the condemnation of his treatise on the Trinity by some who thought it 'unfit that matters of faith should be persuaded by reason', though Christ and the Apostles employed it. It appears to him, however, that reason is 'the main advantage which we have', since Christian authorities are questioned by unbelievers.³ The spirit of his method of dealing with such is expressed in a sentence strikingly similar to a remark made about himself by Chillingworth: 'let us not endeavour to lead them like sheep that follow their shepherd, but drive them like asses with the cudgel of reason.'⁴ Gill is, of course, unaware of the threat to Christianity involved in the Protestant alliance with reason and the freeing of the intellect in which he is himself assisting. The appearance of popular deism is something which he does not anticipate; for, assuming, as he does, that creation is organised on divinely rational principles, that divine revelation necessarily expresses those principles, and that (in a phrase which reminds one of Milton) 'common reason rightly guided' is the 'image of God in us yet remaining, as is plain',⁵ he has no suspicion of the possibility of a clash between revelation and the conclusions drawn by reason from nature. To those who, seeing something of the danger, denied the validity of reason in religion, he answers that it is impossible that 'that especial and principal gift of God to mankind' should not be serviceable in drawing man nearer to his creator, for 'man alone of all the visible creatures is framed and formed of God unto this search, by the outward sense and

¹ Gill's dislike of Scholasticism, so characteristic of the rationalist, is of course shared by the young and the older Milton (see *Prolusion III* and the 'Dedication' of *De Doctrina*), and by Chillingworth, to whom it is a 'weaving and unweaving subtle cobwebs, fitter to catch flies than souls' ('Preface' of *The Religion of Protestants*, p. 12).

² 'Preface', (13).

³ *Ib.*, (2).

⁴ (II), 68. Chillingworth declares himself unwilling to take anything on trust, and unable 'to command myself. . . to follow, like a sheep, every shepherd that should take upon him to guide me. . . but most apt and most willing to be led by reason' ('Preface' of *The Religion of Protestants*, p. 2).

⁵ 'Preface', (2). Cf. *De Doctrina*, P.W., IV, 266.

reason to find the wisdom and power of God in the creature [i.e., the creation]'.¹ Gill would thus equate with Christianity that 'natural religion' which was to become the basis of the deistic philosophy of the next century, and which inevitably resulted from the necessity of finding a place within the Christian scheme for those millions of pagans, the fact of whose existence was forced upon the consciousness of the Renaissance by the voyages of discovery, and whose reprobation to eternal hell-fire had in some way to be accounted for in order to preserve Christianity's exclusive right to the possession of truth. It is by developing the thesis that reason is a sufficient substitute for revelation, though not, of course, as definite or conclusive, that Gill explains both how 'the whole world of infidels and misbelievers be liable to the justice of God for their ignorance of him, for their neglect, and for their unbelief',² and also, exactly as does Milton, how the patriarchs achieved salvation before the promises of scripture were revealed. Since the truths of revelation and the conclusions of rightly guided reason are identical, it follows that 'the same glorious faith which we are taught in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament... must be that very same faith by which all the Saints of God were saved for above two hundred and fifty years before there were any scriptures written',³ and that 'they who either received it not by tradition, as most of the Gentiles, or understood it not in the Law, as few among the Jews did besides the prophets, must of necessity through the light of reason alone hold with us some main and fundamental points, according to which, if they lived in obedience, they might find mercy...'.⁴

Gill's account of the main points which are arrived at logically 'by the light of reason', demands comparison with Herbert's attempt to 'establish certain unshakable foundations of truth supported by universal consent'.⁵ The Christian rationalist and the student of comparative religion are actually basing their conclusions upon the same principles, for Gill's

¹ *Ib.*, (3). Like Milton in *Comus* and *Paradise Lost*, v, Gill elsewhere in the treatise gives an account of man's place in that 'scale of nature' which culminates, so far as creatures are concerned, in the Angels, who 'in more excellent manner, though with their differences and degrees of understanding, without either sense or imagination, by the only light of beholding of things, know the truth of their being, properties, and possibilities; or else, in a superexcellent manner, beholding the Creator, know by him his admirable workmanship'; see pp. 12 and 16.

² *Ib.*, (7). Gill thus explains also why Paul, in preaching at Athens, persuaded by 'common reason and their own poets. Besides Aratus, whose words he cites, you shall find that his speech is in their own phrase and style, and much of the matter in Plato, and in special his *Phaedon*, of the soul's immortality' ('Preface', (11); cf. *Areopagitica*, P.W., p. 63).

³ *Ib.*, (4); cf. *De Doctrina*, P.W., iv, 340-1, and 378.

⁴ *Ib.*, (5). It is a mistake to assume that the idea of a 'natural religion' implies opposition to Christianity. For an excellent Puritan exposition, based on principles like Gill's, see *The Pagan's Debt and Dowry* (1651) of John Goodwin, whose general thought is strikingly similar to Milton's.

⁵ *De Veritate* (1645), p. 49.

'right reason' and Herbert's 'universal consent' amount, in this respect at least, to the same thing. The difference between their lists of fundamentals indicates, however, the difference between the conservatively Christian and the purely rational attitudes. Herbert's five universal beliefs are well known: (1) that there is a God, supreme in power, eternal, good, and the creator of the world; (2) that he is to be worshipped; (3) that he is especially to be worshipped in the good life; (4) that hence repentance is necessary; (5) that there is an after life, in which rewards and punishments are apportioned. All these are included, if not specifically, at least by implication, in Gill's scheme; but to them he adds an essentially, though not of course exclusively, Christian idea. His fundamentals are, (1) 'that there is a God, infinite in goodness'; (2) 'that this God is the maker of all things'; (3) that man is immortal; (4) that salvation must come through a divine mediator, since man himself is obviously in a state of depravity which makes him incapable of saving himself.¹

To prove these beliefs the necessary conclusions of discursive reasoning, and consequently Christianity the true religion, is the stated purpose of his treatise; and though he attempts to preserve an attitude of detachment, it is obvious that he cannot conduct his enquiry with Herbert's disinterestedness. The step he has taken in attempting to submit the dispute between the believer and the unbeliever to the sole arbitration of reason is a momentous one; but, if he is a rationalist, he is also a strictly orthodox, seventeenth-century Christian, and there remains for him, as there did not for Herbert, the problem of mediating between reason and faith. He cannot allow reason the freedom which he sincerely thinks desirable, because he cannot allow it to contradict the conclusions already established as orthodox on other grounds. Reason must therefore be brought into line with authority; and, in spite of the proposed arbitration of reason, scripture remains the final standard, and not merely scripture—for Gill is orthodox—but scripture interpreted according to the Apostles' Creed and the judgment of the Church. He thus arrives at a position similar to Chillingworth's, while the relationship between his position and Milton's is comparatively simple; for, if one deducts from Gill's position the element of orthodoxy, one has virtually that which Milton was finally to assume. Both insist upon the necessity of reason in things religious and both insist upon the authority of scripture; they differ only—but significantly—in that Milton denies the right of any other authority to pass judgment upon the validity of reason's interpretation of scripture.

¹ 'Preface', (5-6).

In consequence of his orthodoxy, Gill is constantly diverted from his frontal attack on atheism to skirmishings with heretics, and his wide knowledge of heresies, ancient and modern, is somewhat surprising. Writing to Atterbury, Bishop Smalridge remarked, 'The best use I have made of him is to know the heretics who have opposed it [the Creed], and their opinions. Perhaps others have done it better, but I have not heard of them'.¹ Perhaps Milton made a similar use of his master, and although one hesitates to add another to the list of innumerable 'sources' of Milton's opinions, it is interesting to discover in Gill accounts of many of the heresies which ultimately found a place in his thought. One may mention here the long discussion of heretical views of the Trinity;² of the error of the Theopaschites that God in Christ suffered on the cross, and the error that Christ could die in his godhead;³ of the doctrine of the Sadducees, of 'that Arabian error of the Thnetopsychitae, that the soul doth die with the body', and that of 'our late dreamers the Psychopannychitae, who affirm that the soul sleeps in the grave till it be awakened again with the body at the general resurrection';⁴ and the elaborate account of theories of creation, both pagan and Christian, in which are traced at length the opinions of philosophers on the eternity of matter.⁵ It is on occasions such as this last that Gill's learning is displayed, and a list of the writers to whom he makes reference indicates the kind of reading to which his teaching must have directed Milton's mind.⁶ Pagan and Christian alike are brought to the support of his argument, and Plato and Aristotle constantly appear to show how far natural reason can go. But when the conclusions of natural reason do not support the beliefs of Christians, Gill turns to the scriptures; 'for God is not the God of nature only, but much more the God of grace and mercy; and to the knowledge of these principles and the conclusions gathered thereon, we are led by better guides than Aristotle ever knew, that is, the Holy Scriptures and the Spirit of Grace, who leads us to the right meaning thereof'.⁷

For him, as for Chillingworth, 'the Bible is the religion of Protestants', and it is only when reason is directed by the Spirit and functions

¹ Quoted by Bliss, ed. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, II, 598.

² Chaps. 9-11.

³ (II), 32, 85.

⁴ (II), 90-1.

⁵ (I), 45, 94.

⁶ In connection with the creation Gill refers to, among others, Plato, Aristotle, Heraclitus, Archelaus, Empedocles, Plutarch, Ovid, and 'the divine Cabala', the study of which last, he elsewhere remarks, 'above all other knowledges . . . doth advance a man's meditation on high' (*Trinity*, (II), 224). Of other philosophers and writers whom he esteems, one may mention, apart from the fathers, Zeno, Plotinus, Dionysius the Areopagite, Ficino, Mirandola, Nicholas of Cusa, Petrus Blondus, Grotius, John Reuchlin, Sandys, Selden, Henry Ainsworth, and William Ames.

⁷ (I), 62.

according to 'the infallible rules of God's word', that it becomes 'right reason'. He is aware, however, that, even with this limitation, the chances of disagreement and error are great, and he therefore asserts that 'nothing is to be taken for truth' which is dishonourable to God, contrary to any article of the faith, the commandments, the Lord's prayer, 'or any received doctrine which is plainly taught' in scripture, against 'common reason and understanding, or repugnant to civil custom and good manners'.¹ Moreover, like all Protestant rationalists, he insists that 'though some things be hard, yet the fundamental points of our religion, as the articles of our faith and the rules of Christian life, are plain and easy to be understood'; and hence, though in harder places 'that ought not to be taken for the true meaning... which everyone according to his private fancy is able to wring out', the scriptures are 'certainly for every one's interpretation, privately to his own understanding, according to the measure of his capacity'.² Thus, though he is far from setting aside the authority of the Church, the liberalising tendency of rationalism, a tendency which will be carried farther by Milton and farther still by some among Milton's contemporaries, is already apparent in Gill; for God 'requires nothing to be believed for which he doth not abundantly satisfy the understanding, if it will enlarge itself and desire to be satisfied',³ and 'hath not given us the knowledge of himself in his word that, as parrots in a cage which with much ado are taught a few words and then can say no more, so we should hold ourselves content when we can say the Creed; but that, by continual meditation on his word, our knowledge, and so our love and fear of him, might be increased daily'.⁴

There can ultimately be for Gill no opposition between faith and reason. In one sense they are complementary; 'for reason is busied in the proof of some general conclusion, which is to be held for a truth, and so received of every man; but faith is the application of that conclusion to a man's own self'.⁵ In another sense—the sense more usually taken in the treatise—faith is an extension of reason, 'is a supply of reason in things understandable, as the imagination is of sight in things that are visible'.⁶ Like Milton, Gill has no tendency to lose himself in an 'O altitudo!'; for, though he is aware of the limitations of human reason, he is convinced

¹ (ii), 155–6. Cf. Chillingworth on 'right reason, grounded on divine revelation and common notions, written by God in the hearts of all men, and deducing, according to the never-failing rules of logic, consequent deductions from them' ('Preface' of *The Religion of Protestants*, p. 8).

² (ii), 154–5; compare *Of Reformation*, P.W., II, 387–9.

³ 'Preface', (15); compare *The Reason of Church Government*, P.W., II, 440.

⁴ (i), 65; compare *Areopagitica*, P.W., II, 65.

⁵ 'Preface', (16).

⁶ *Ib.*, (9–10).

that what is not understood is yet 'understandable', is rational and not mysterious, just as what is beyond the reach of sight is yet 'visible'; and he is convinced that, with divine assistance, human capacity for understanding may be increased. This is the inevitable tendency of the human soul; 'because reason and understanding is more natural to the soul of man than to believe, and because the soul, as every other thing, joys in the natural abilities of itself, therefore, though the reasonable soul do believe what it is taught by the Spirit of Christ instructing it, yet, if that blessed Spirit vouchsafe further to enable the natural abilities that it may see the reason of the lessons taught, it triumphs more therein'.¹ The germ of that idea of the necessity of 'closing up truth to truth' which is expressed in one of the most striking passages of the *Areopagitica*, and which bulked so largely in the demand of the sects for toleration, is clearly discernible in the rationalism of the orthodox Gill. There is a place in his scheme for 'the higher speculation of them whom God shall vouchsafe to enlighten for their further progress from faith to faith, from knowledge to knowledge, till all the holy church come to be partakers of those things, new and old, that are kept for her in store, when she shall come unto the fulness of the measure of the age of Christ, that is, the perfect knowledge of all those things which our Lord in his time taught his disciples, who were not able then to bear them, till they had received the light of the Holy Spirit from above'.²

If the zeal of Young's sermon has its echo in Milton's prose, the spirit of rational faith which these words of Gill express finds its reflection there also. And if Milton tended to move farther and farther from the principles of Young, it was largely as a result of the extended application which he gave to the rationalism developed by thinkers like Gill. The problems of his thought are largely the problems involved in the concept of right reason, and the effort of his prose to establish the principles upon which right reason should function in society is not unlike Gill's effort to establish its place in religion.

In *Paradise Lost* one finds Milton attempting to explain the failure of right reason to achieve its ideal end, and the lesson which that poem inculcates has its counterpart in Gill as well. The delicate balance of that God-given instrument was clear in Gill's mind, and he points to the danger of seduction awaiting man in his use of it, in a passage which expresses with the most striking clarity the central thought of Milton's prose and poetry, and expresses it, moreover, in terms of the Fall.

¹ 'Preface', (9).

² *Ib.*, (18); cf. *Areopagitica*, P.W., II, 89-90.

You have need to know that this reason and the like which we make from our understanding, hath a most sure foundation in the truth of God; for therefore is the light of reason and understanding in man, as a glass or image of the divine wisdom, created by him in us (John 1. 4; Eph. 4. 24) that we thereby might be led unto the knowledge of him and so unto that happiness for which we are created. Therefore the understanding doth evermore apply itself unto the truth, and makes the will to joy therein and to hate that which is false and impossible. For reason in man, being the image of Christ, the second Adam, is set in the Paradise of God, freely to eat of every tree therein, that is, to consider the whole creature, which yields unto reason infinite truths as fruit whereon to feed, to the praise of him that hath created it. But if she that is given to him for his help, that is, the imagination his *Hevah*, the mother of all living (for by the imagination alone the forms of all things live and are lively presented to reason), if she, I say, deal treacherously with him, and without him entertain speech with the crafty Serpent, then is he by her easily persuaded to taste of the forbidden fruit, to follow her foolish and wicked suggestions and to let into his understanding falsehood and errors, which cannot stand with the light of the truth, but are only according to the traditions of arts, falsely so called, and the authorities of men misled by opinions.¹

Whether or not Milton remembered this passage, or whether, indeed, he ever read it, is of little importance; for the idea which it expresses must have entered his mind with the knowledge he acquired under the direction of one who was by no means unworthy to be the headmaster of Colet's school.²

ARTHUR BARKER.

TORONTO.

¹ (1), 51-2.

² I desire to express my gratitude to the University of London, which has aided the publication of this article by a grant from its Publications Fund.

KEATS AND LUCRETIVS

No substantiated observation of poetical and philosophical affinities between Lucretius and Keats appears to be recorded. By mere coincidence De Quincey's remarks on Lucretius occur in his review of Keats as presented by Gilfillan's *Gallery of Literary Portraits*, and no attempt is made to relate their work.¹ It would seem that Professor Herford was the first to recognize a correspondence in the quality of melancholy in Keats and Lucretius, but his inclusion of Dürer and Wordsworth in the same statement indicates the generality of his comment.² More recently, in a broad summary of Lucretian influence, Keats is dispatched in a catalogue with some twenty other poets of the nineteenth century as revealing contacts with the Roman's poem, though no attempt is made to present evidence for the assertion.³

Indeed, at first glance there would seem to be little in common between *De Rerum Natura* and the compositions of John Keats. But that here, however, is another instance of the strong influence which translated classics had on the romantic poet's mind and work is apparent when an examination of the popular Creech version of Lucretius discloses numerous ties in phrase, imagery, and thought with passages in Keats. To suggest the way in which Keats may have been introduced to Lucretius, to point out the most striking word and image parallels between his work and Creech's translation, and to show how the sources of some of Keats's ideas and desires towards a firm philosophy are to be sought in the reasonings of Lucretius is the design of this study.

I

There is some possibility that Keats may have encountered either a Latin text of Lucretius, or an English translation, or both, at the Reverend John Clarke's Enfield school, which he attended from 1803 until 1810. Cowden Clarke, perhaps, inadvertently affords a clue to the accessibility of Lucretius on the school's bookshelves when he reports of his father:

He took a peculiar interest in the work, much pursued at that time, of Biblical translation, and closely watched the labours of Gilbert Wakefield, the translator of

¹ David Masson, ed., *The Collected Writings of Thomas De Quincey* (Edinburgh, 1890), xi, 377-93.

² C. H. Herford, *The Poetry of Lucretius* (1917 John Rylands Library Lecture, Manchester, 1918), p. 25. Possibly his reference to Keats was suggested by his immediately previous essay on Keats for *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (1916), xii, 87-103. The passing reference that J. W. Duff makes in *A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age* (7th ed., New York, 1927), p. 286, 'Lucretius, like Keats, is "half in love with easeful Death"', is completely indefensible.

³ G. D. Hadzitts, *Lucretius and his Influence* (New York, 1935), p. 362.

the New Testament; and the eminent surgeon Mason Good—a self-educated classic—who produced a fine version of Job, the result of his Sunday morning's devotion.¹

If the Reverend John Clarke's interest extended beyond the scriptural industry of these two men, he must certainly have known of their prominence in the Lucretian scholarship of the day and he may well have possessed their books. Wakefield had brought out a three-volume edition of Lucretius in 1796–7 in London,² and Good had practically reprinted Wakefield's text beside his translation of Lucretius into blank verse which appeared in 1805³ and which Lord Jeffrey equitably reviewed.⁴ Moreover, if any credence is placed in Cowden Clarke's description of the last year and a half of Keats's residence at the school more links with Lucretius will be found:

He must in those last months have exhausted the school library.... The books, however, that were his constantly recurrent sources of attraction were Tooke's 'Pantheon', Lemprière's 'Classical Dictionary' which he appeared to *learn*, and Spence's 'Polymetis'.⁵

Here again, the young student may have been introduced to Lucretius and his curiosity aroused sufficiently to make him pursue an acquaintanceship with the Latin poet's work. Lemprière speaks admiringly of Lucretius as

a celebrated poet and philosopher... whose poem shows that he wrote Latin better than any other man ever did, and who would have proved no mean rival of Virgil, had he lived in the polished age of Augustus.⁶

In much the same vein Spence refers to two of the most magnificent passages in Lucretius⁷ and grants him a high place in his introduction as one who

joined poetry to philosophy: where his subject gives him leave, he discovers a great deal of spirit, and in all his digressions, he appears to have been of a more poetical turn than Virgil himself; which is partly owned in the fine compliment Virgil pays him in his *Georgics*, i, ii, 492. His subject often forces him to go on heavily for a hundred lines together; but wherever he breaks out, he breaks out like lightning from a cloud, all at once, with force and brightness.⁸

It is quite plausible that, if Keats encountered these evaluations while

¹ Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke, *Recollections of Writers* (London, 1878), p. 5.

² For condemnation of his work see J. E. Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1908), II, 430–1; for faint praise, see H. A. J. Munro, *T. Lucreti Carus* (4th ed., London, 1920), p. 19; for honour, see *D.N.B.*, s.n. xx, 452–5.

³ John Mason Good, *The Nature of Things: A Didactic Poem translated from the Latin of Titus Lucretius Carus* (London, 1805), I and II. Henceforth referred to as *Good*.

⁴ 'Article XV', *The Edinburgh Review* (1807), x, 217–34. 'Upon the whole, this book is very dull, and, as a translation, very flat and unpoetical... The version is sometimes pleasing, and sometimes vigorous; and Mr Good's own speculations, though often intruded rather awkwardly, are by no means despicable' (p. 234). Many of the 'speculations' to which Jeffrey refers are on Hebraic parallels to Lucretius which Good quotes and translates in his copious notes and which would have warmed the clerical cockles of the Reverend John Clarke's heart.

⁵ *Recollections*, pp. 123–4.

⁶ *A Classical Dictionary* (6th ed., London, 1806), sig. Dd.

⁷ *Spence's Polymetis* (abridged by N. Tindal, 6th ed., London, 1802), pp. 78–9, note g;

⁸ *Ibid.* ut supra, p. iv.

he was engaged in his translation of the *Aeneid*, he may have been prompted to examine the merits of Virgil's acknowledged peer. But whether the beauties of Lucretius broke upon Keats with 'force and brightness' when he was studying at the Enfield school, or during his apprenticeship at Edmonton, or not until he met Leigh Hunt and was drawing on his library in the summer of 1816,¹ there can be no doubt but that by the fall of the same year he had thoroughly familiarized himself with Thomas Creech's translation of *De Rerum Natura*. For it was in October 1816, after his memorable session with Cowden Clarke over the Chapman folio, that Keats struck off his sonnet, 'On First Looking into Chapman's Homer', which reveals definite recollections of Creech's volume.² In this instance, however, it was not Thomas Creech but John Evelyn who supplied Keats with a suggestive model for his sonnet when, in a complimentary mood on 15 December 1682, he addressed these verses 'To Mr Creech on His accurate Version of Lucretius':

'Tis true perswaded that there was *rich Ore*
 I boldly Launch'd, & would *new Worlds* explore:
 Deep Mines I saw, and hidden Wealth to lie
 In Rocky Entrails, and in Sierras high:
 I saw a fruitful Soil, by none yet trod,
 Reserv'd for Hero's, or some Demy-God;
 And urg'd my Fortune on;—
 'Till rugged Billows, and a dang'rous Coast
 My vent'rous Bark, and rash Attempt had Crost;
 When Landing, un-known Paths, and hard Access,
 Made me despond of Pre-conceiv'd success;
 I turn'd my Prow, and the Discov'ry made,
 But was too Weak, too Poor my self to Trade,
 Much less to make a Conquest and Subdue;
 That glorious Enterprise was left for You.
 Columbus thus, only discover'd Land,
 But it was Won by *Great Corteze's* hand;
 As with *rich Spoils of goodly Kingdoms* fraught,
 They immense Treasure to Iberia brought;
 So You the rich Lucretius (unknown
 To th' English world) bravely have made Your Own,
 And by just Title, You deserve the Crown.

Creech perceived the advertising value of this congratulatory poem from the noble translator of the first book of Lucretius, and together with kindred verses by Otway, Duke, Mrs Behn, Waller and others, he placed

¹ See Professor de Selincourt's summary of the case for Hunt's early acquaintance with Keats in *The Poems of John Keats* (5th rev., London, 1926), pp. 594-5. Henceforth referred to as *De Selincourt*.

² The announcement of this discovery and a brief statement of the knowledge that Keats's contemporaries and favourite authors had of Creech and Lucretius will be found in the writer's note, 'Keats's Chapman Sonnet', *T.L.S.*, 25 January 1936, p. 75. For previous summaries and opinions of sources for the sonnet see F. S. Boas, 'On First Looking into Chapman's Homer', *The John Keats Memorial Volume* (London, 1921), pp. 39-44; B. I. Evans, 'Keats's Approach to the Chapman Sonnet', *Essays and Studies of the English Association* (1931), xiv, 26-52. *De Selincourt*, Notes, pp. 398-9 and 565-6.

it at the head of his volume.¹ The popularity of Creech's work is attested by its frequent reprintings, often (after 1700) in conjunction with Dryden's translated extracts from Lucretius.²

One of these editions with its full force of rhymed endorsements must have caught the eye of Keats, for the sum of the correspondence between his sonnet and Evelyn's lines cannot be attributed to mere coincidence. Both are in praise of a famous translation of a classic; both record in historical and geographical terms the writer's enthusiasm on making a literary exploration among 'realms of gold' and 'rich Ore', both set forth the commanding figure and name of 'stout' or 'great' Cortez; and finally, the 'goodly states and Kingdoms' of Keats is a patent expansion of the 'goodly Kingdoms' in Evelyn. Moreover Keats's excellent conception of travelling among islands which bards in fealty to Apollo hold, or which are reserved for heroes or some demigod, may derive some of its stimulus from the majestic reference which Lucretius makes to Empedocles and Sicily.³ Creech brings this relevant section close to Keats:

This Isle, who with such wondrous sights as these
Doth call forth Trav'lers, and the Curious please;
Is rich with Men and Fruit, hath rarely shown
A thing more Glorious than this single One.
His verse compos'd of Nature's Works declare
His Wit was strong, and his Invention rare.⁴

The rest of the verse commendations which Creech paraded at the head of his volume do not appear to have stirred Keats's imagination,⁵ but a

¹ Titus Lucretius Carus *His Six Books of Epicurean Philosophy Done into English Verse with Notes* (5th ed., London, 1700), sig. A 4 recto and verso. Henceforth referred to as *Creech*. Although Creech's volume was published in 1682, all my quotations are from the fifth edition which is the earliest available to me in perfect form. It should be pointed out, though, that Evelyn's verses were printed at least as early as the third edition (1683) and that the pagination is the same in all the editions I have been able to consult. The italics here are my own.

² Bibliographical catalogues record the following editions, beyond those of 1683, 1699, 1700 and 1714 which are accessible to me in the Harvard College Library:

1717, 1722: R. Watt, *Bibliotheca Britannica* (Edinburgh, 1824), i, 269.

1712, 1731: W. T. Lowndes, *The Bibliographer's Manual of English Literature* (London, 1860), pt. 5, iii, 1411.

1759: S. A. Allibone, *A Critical Dictionary of English Literature* (Philadelphia, 1874), i, 149.

1715, 1744, 1776: W. Engelmann, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum* (Leipzig, 1882), ii, 403.

The *D.N.B.*, xiii, 65, asserts: 'Creech's translation of Lucretius vied in popularity with Dryden's Virgil and Pope's Homer', and Dr Nott in 1799 could speak of it as 'the best I am acquainted with made in any language. . . This work is so well known and so generally esteemed, that I need not comment upon it. Even Dryden . . . yields the palm to him; and confesses Creech's manner is preferable to his own.' *The First Book of Titus Lucretius Carus on the Nature of Things* (London, 1799), p. viii. ³ i, 716-33. ⁴ Creech, p. 23.

⁵ There is a slight and commonplace resemblance noticeable in some lines of the last anonymous panegyric (*Creech*, sig. D verso):

But when with charming Stroaks and Powerful Lines
Some curious Titian the great work designs;
The lively Figures all our Passions move
And as if Real, we obey, and love:

with a line in Keats's 'Epistle to John Hamilton Reynolds', l. 19: 'Some Titian colors touch'd into real life' (*De Selincourt*, p. 270).

reminiscence of Evelyn's first four lines was still active when in *The Fall of Hyperion* (I, 271-4), the poet wrote

As I had found
A grain of gold upon a mountain's side
And, twinged with avarice, strain'd out my eyes
To search its sullen entrails rich with ore.

With this bit of evidence that Keats gleaned more from Creech than merely suggestions for his Chapman sonnet,¹ an investigation of the relation of Creech's translation to Keats's other work is now invited.

II

Although much that is picturesque in Lucretius suffers loss of colour in Creech's translation, the most notable passages emerge with a sublimity that claimed the attention of Keats. The celebrated lines in which Lucretius defends his mingling of poetry and science must have aroused Keats's interest.:

Next, tho my Subject's *dark*, my Verse is *clear*,
And *sweet*, with fancy flowing everywhere:
And this design'd. For as Physicians use
In giving Children Draughts of Bitter Juice,
To make them take it, tinge the Cup with sweet,
To cheat the Lip: this first they *eager* meet,
And then drink on, and take the bitter Draught,
And so are harmlessly deceiv'd, not *caught*:
For by this cheat they get their health, their ease,
Their vigour, strength, and baffle the Disease.
So since our Methods of *Philosophy*
Seem harsh to some, since most our Maxims flie,
I thought it was the fittest way to dress
These rigid Principles in pleasing Verse,
With Fancy sweetning them; to bribe thy mind...²

¹ Further minor elements converging toward the creation of the sonnet might possibly include Keats's compounding in his memory of the phrase 'new planet swims into his ken' from Creech's reference (p. 36) to atoms 'that swim in a wide *Void* alone', and those (p. 10) 'beyond the ken e'en of the sharpest Eye'. Cp. Creech's frequent use of 'ken' (pp. 6, 187, *et passim*) with Keats's fondness for the word (*Calidore*, l. 56; *Endymion*, II, 796, III, 216; *The Fall of Hyperion*, I, 303).

² Creech, p. 29. Cp. *Lucr.* I, 933-47. Keats may also have remembered Tasso's incorporation of this section in the third stanza of *Gerusalemme Liberata*, but Fairfax's translation, which Woodhouse listed as one of the books in the poet's library [Sidney Colvin, *John Keats* (London, 1920), p. 559], does not use the words 'fancy' and 'cheat'. Dryden translates *Lucr.* IV, 1101, 'So love with phantoms cheats our longing eyes' [G. R. Noyes, ed., *The Poetical Works of John Dryden* (Boston, 1904), p. 189, l. 67], but does not english the relevant passage. *Good*, I, 153, and II, 7, renders this as 'the venial cheat', and again, II, 147, writes of 'the cheated mind of man'. Creech's numerous allusions to the cheat and deceit of fancy, however, grant him property rights in the expression. Thus Creech, p. 206, has

A vain Objection this, and Fancy's cheat.
Also cp. pp. 53, 79, 94, 131, 135. Especially characteristic is his marginal caption, p. 124, 'Why these Fancies seem real' with these lines adjacent to it in the text:
This Cheat must be, because the Sense is gone
Bound up by Sleep; for by the Sense alone
Fancied from Real, True from False is known.

For with the guile and trumpery of fancy alluded to twice here and doubly again by the repetition in the fourth book¹ the poet's recollection of this expression was assured. Thus Keats evoked the memory of these lines when in *Endymion* he wrote

Hence pageant history! hence gilded cheat!²

Again, they may be present in his song on Fancy:

With a still mysterious stealth:
She will mix these pleasures up
Like three fit wines in a cup
And thou shalt quaff it.³

Certainly they were in his mind when he concluded his futile flight on the 'viewless wings of Poesy' in the despairing lines of the *Ode to a Nightingale*:

Adieu! the fancy cannot cheat so well
As she is fam'd to do, deceiving elf.⁴

Nor is this the only Lucretian element discernible in the famous ode. Creech's 'bitter Draught' may have been flung away, but the poet's glorious draught of vintage full of the warm south,

Tasting of Flora and the country green
Dance and Provençal song and sunburnt mirth,⁵

conceivably owes its immortal bouquet to the pageantry of the seasons in Lucretius. Spence,⁶ it may be noticed, had particularly commended the cask from which Keats drew this old wine for his new measures:

Thus th' *Seasons* of the Year
First *Spring*, and *Venus* kindest Powers inspire
Melting Thoughts, soft *Wishes*, gay *Desire*,
And warm *Favonius* fans the *Amorous* fire:
Then Mother *Flora* to prepare the way,
Makes all the *Field* look *glorious*, green, and gay,
And *freely* scatters with a *bounteous* Hand
Her sweetest, fairest *Flowers* o're the Land.
Next *Heat*, and *dusty Harvest* takes the place
And soft *Etesias* fan the *Sun-burnt* face.

¹ Creech, pp. 102-3. Cp. *Lucr.* iv, 8-22.

² II, 14. Creech, p. 5, may also be remembered:

But still some frightful Tales, some furious Threats
By Poets form'd, those grave and holy Cheats,
May bias thee; E'en I could easily find
A thousand Stories to distract thy Mind.

³ ll. 36-9. *De Selincourt*, p. 198.

⁴ ll. 83-4. Also cp. *Endymion*, iv, 653-6:

No, never more
Shall airy voices cheat me to the shore
Of tangled wonders, breathless and aghast.
Adieu, my daintiest Dream.

⁵ ll. 13-14.

⁶ *Op. cit.* pp. 78-9, note g: 'Lucretius' description of the Seasons is one of his finest passages, and seems to have been copied from some ancient procession. Not one of his allegories is conducted so regularly as this...'

Then *sweaty Autumn* treads the Noble Vine,
 And *flowing* bunches give *immortal Wine*;
 Next roars the *strong-lung'd Southern blast* . . .
 And next deep Winter creeps, gray, wrinkled, old,
 His *Teeth* all shatter, *Limbs* all shake with Cold.¹

Another majestic procession to which Spence referred could not have failed to attract Keats:

The *Poets* sing, that thro the Heaven above, *The fable of Cybele*
 She Chariots, drawn by yoked *Lions*, drove,
 And riding to and fro she wanders there . . .
 Her lofty head a *Mural* Garland wears,
 Because she Towns and stately castles bears;
 And thus adorn'd with gawdy Pomp and Show,
 Goes thro our Towns, and as she passes thro,
 The *Vulgar* fear, and all with Reverence bow.
 Concerning her, *fond Superstition* frames
 A thousand odd Conceits, a thousand Names,
 And gives her a large Train of *Phrygian* Dames:
 Because in *Phrygia* Corn at first took Birth
 And thence was scatter'd o're the other Earth.
 They Eunuch all her priests . . .
 Amidst her Pomp *fierce* Drums and Cymbals beat,
 And the *Hoarse* Horns with *rattling* notes do threat:
 The Pipe with *Phrygian* Aires disturbs their Souls
 Till Reason overthrown, mad Passion rules:
 They carry Arms, those dreadful signs of War,
 To raise i' th' impious Rout Religious fear:
 When carried thus in Pomp thro Towns she goes,
 And Health on all she *silently* bestows;
 With offer'd Money they bestrew the Plain
 And Roses cover her, and all her Train.
 Here some in Arms dance round among the crowd
 Look *dreadful gay* in their own sparkling Blood,
 Their Crests still shaking with a dreadful Nod.
 These represent those armed Priests, who strove
 To drown the tender cries of *Infant* Jove;
 By dancing quick they made a greater sound,
 And beat their Armour as they danc'd around,
 Lest *Saturn*, should have found, and eat the Boy
 And Ops forever mourn'd her *prattling* Joy.
 For this her Train is arm'd . . .²

¹ Creech, p. 162. Cp. *Lucr.* v, 737–44. Creech deserves credit for contributing towards the happy phrase 'sunburnt mirth'. Here he uses 'Sun-burnt face' possibly because of the suggestion of 'aridus' (*Lucr.* v, 741) but it appears to be one of his choice interpolations. Thus as in rendering *Lucr.* vi, 722: 'inter nigra virum percocto saecula colore' he grants that the Nile 'cuts its way thro *Sunburnt Negroes Land*' (p. 207). Moreover, for *Lucr.* v, 1397–1404, Creech (p. 183) does an excellent passage in idiomatic English, and the dance and mirth of the country green are vividly near:

Then *laughing*, merry Jests, and Country-play,
 And *Tales* began, as *Once upon a Day*:
 Then pleasant *Songs* they sang, and wanton grown
 Each pluck't, and bound his Flowers, and made a crown,
 And with *uneven* steps they danc't around.

The lines in *The Tempest*, iv, i, 134–8, may have suggested this phrasing to both Creech and Keats.

² Creech, pp. 51–2.

How much colour and stimulus Keats received from these images is beyond gauging. It is probable, however, that this picture of Cybele and her yoked lions reinforced a similar memory of her from Ovid and accounts for her awesome entry in *Endymion*¹; that the recollection of this procession influenced some of the hysterical and febrile stanzas of *The Cap and Bells*;² and that the allusion to Saturn and Ops may have served Keats as another fingerpost toward his treatment of the Hyperion story.

Still another subject which evoked some of the most moving lines in Lucretius as he strode along toward the accomplishment of his purpose, was the pathos and futility of the sacrificial scene. In his indignant description of Iphigenia:

Unhappy Maid! With sacred Ribbands bound
(Religion's Pride,) and holy Garlands crown'd
To meet an undeserv'd untimely Fate,
Led by the Grecian Chiefs in Pomp and State,
She saw her Father by, whose Tears did flow
In streams, the only pity he could show:
She saw the crafty Priest conceal the Knife
From him, bless'd and prepar'd against her Life:
She saw her Citizens with weeping Eyes
Unwillingly attend the Sacrifice:
Then dumb with Grief her Tears did pity crave,
But 'Twas beyond her Father's power to save:
In vain did Innocence, Youth and Beauty plead,³

Lucretius may have furnished corroborative literary sources for whatever sculpturesque information Keats had for the garlanded heifer, the mysterious priest, and the folk attending the sacrifice in the *Ode to a Grecian Urn*.⁴

Thus, some of the most familiar lines in Keats reveal close ties in figure and expression with many of the famous passages in Lucretius. To the poet who looked upon fine phrases as a lover there was indeed much in Creech's Lucretius to satisfy this young man's fancy. It is tempting to point out further resemblances in phraseology between these two poets as they deal with the Nile, the extravagance of lovers, processions of the seasons, autumnal mists, and numerous other natural phenomena. But to place too much emphasis on mere correspondence in word and image is to obscure the more important correspondence of idea and content.

¹ II, 639-49. Ovid's passage as translated by Sandys (*Metamorphoses*, I) is closer verbally than Lucretius, especially to the first draught. See *De Sélincourt*, Notes, pp. 433-4. Good (I, 115), in his notes on 'turret-crowned' Cybele in Ovid, Virgil, and elsewhere, is most thorough here.

² LXV-LXVI. The 'black gnomes scattering sixpences like rain' may hark back to the priests in Creech who 'with offer'd Money...bestrew the Plain'. The troops of Janizaries, the chaplain in cassock, and the twelve physicians are at least more Lucretian than they are like the 'old pageant of Aurora's train'.

³ Creech, p. 4. Cf. the bombast in *Otho the Great*, v, 5, 148-55.

⁴ II. 31-40. Cf. Creech, p. 45, on the sacrificial heifer.

It must suffice to have indicated specific verbal links between Keats and Lucretius here. How the hooked atomic images that massed together in the chaos of Keats's reading of Lucretius, like those which Professor Lowes charted in the cosmic processes of Coleridge's mind, had a significance beyond their pictorial quality in the shaping of the young poet's thought, now deserves consideration.

III

The cornerstone of Lucretian philosophy is, of course, the atom, and Keats was too much of a poetic builder to reject even so minute a particle. Whether he is composing *Endymion*,

Look not so wilder'd; for these things are true,
And never can be born of atomies
That buzz about our slumbers, like brain-flies,
Leaving us fancy-sick,¹

or endowing the lamia with the mind of a sage:

Not one hour old, yet of sciential brain
To unperplex bliss from its neighbour pain;
Define their pettish limits, and estrange
Their points of contact, and swift counterchange;
Intrigue with specious chaos, and dispart
Its most ambiguous atoms,²

or exclaiming of Saturn:

Thou
Hast sifted well the atom-universe,³

Keats's phrases betray his association with the atomic theory most nobly set forth by Lucretius.⁴

¹ Cp. Creech, pp. 130-2 on atomic composition of dream delusions. See pp. 166-7, 'These are Creatures of the Brain'. Moreover, see *De Selincourt*, Notes, p. 433, for an account of Keats's revision of the first draught of *Endymion*, II, 526-33, and especially note the line 'Speak not one atom of thy paltry stuff'.

² *Lamia*, I, 191-6. Cp. especially Creech, pp. 69-70, on the effect of the teachings of Epicurus:

All fears and terrors wast, and fly apace.
Thro parted Heavens I see the mighty Space,
The Rise of Things, the Gods. . .
And thro the Earth I can distinctly view
What underneath the busy Atoms do.

³ *Hyperion*, II, 182-3.

⁴ Elsewhere Keats shows a strong preference for 'atom' when expressing the utmost particles of matter. Thus in the sonnet to the young lady who sent him a laurel crown (II. 3-4; *De Selincourt*, p. 52):

Not an atom less
Than the proud laurel shall content my bier,
and in the preface to *Endymion* (*De Selincourt*, p. 52), 'This is not written with the least atom of purpose to forestall criticisms', and again in the desperation of his sonnet to Fanny (II. 9-10; *De Selincourt*, p. 287):

Yourself—your soul—in pity give me all
Withhold no atom's atom or I die.

Furthermore, in a letter to Rice on 24 March 1818, Keats became as scientific in statement as Lucretius could have wished any poet-disciple of his to be:

I must let you know that as there is ever the same quantity of matter constituting the habitable globe—as the ocean notwithstanding the enormous changes and revolutions taking place in some or other of its desmesnes—notwithstanding Water-spouts whirlpools and mighty Rivers emptying themselves into it, it still is made up of the same bulk—nor ever varies the number of its Atoms—and as a certain bulk of Water was instituted at the Creation—so very likely a certain portion of intellect was spun forth into the thin Air for the brains of Man to prey upon it.¹

It would be an exercise of what Professor Babbitt called 'supersubtlety' to discover any pronounced philosophy in the works of Keats which deal with the senses rather than mental concepts, or even to distinguish and to claim sole derivation for his vague ideas on cosmic generation from such diverse writers as Ovid, Spenser, Milton and Wordsworth.² The mentality of Keats, like that of most young men, was a compounding of irresolutions unified and vitalized only by his desire to make a literary name for himself. No one was more frank about his own case than himself, and in this same letter which seems momentarily to indicate his agreement with the atomic theory, he confessed how distant from him was the contentment, perhaps, of those in the Garden of Epicurus:

What a happy thing it would be if we could settle our thoughts, make our minds up on any matter in five minutes and remain content—that is to build a sort of mental cottage of feelings quiet and pleasant—to have a sort of Philosophical Back Garden and cheerful holiday-keeping front one—but alas! this never can be....³

Keats did have, however, certain reactions and attitudes toward accepted systems of thought and behaviour on which he vented his opinions, and whose reflection of the Lucretian manner elicits observation and comparison. Some of the vehemence with which Lucretius denounced

¹ M. S. Forman, ed., *The Letters of John Keats* (2nd rev., New York, 1935), p. 123. Hereafter referred to as *Letters*. Cp. especially Creech, p. 204:

<i>Why the</i>	Now I must sing, my <i>Muse</i> , why greedy <i>Seas</i>
<i>Seas not</i>	Devour <i>Water</i> still, yet ne're increase:
<i>Increase.</i>	For it seems strange that <i>Rivers</i> still should <i>flow</i> ,
	And run for numerous <i>Years</i> as much as now;
	And tho they <i>daily</i> bring a <i>mighty Store</i> ,
	The <i>Spacious Ocean</i> should increase no more, etc.

For the atomic composition of the mind see Creech, pp. 74-5; for whirlwinds and water-spouts see p. 199.

² Again it must be pointed out that all of these poets owe much to Lucretius. Thus, for example, these lines from *Endymion*: 'to watch the abysm-birth of elements' (II, 28); 'dark as the parentage of chaos' (II, 912); and 'the feud 'twixt nothing and Creation' (III, 41), though paralleled in the Ovidian and Miltonic creations, may be immediately or indirectly traceable to Lucretius. Cp. Creech, p. 2, 'From darksome Chaos deep and ugly Womb'; p. 38, 'how atoms strove thro the vast empty space'; and p. 31, 'unthinking seeds... from Eternal thro the Vacuum strove'.

³ *Letters*, p. 122.

the baneful results of superstitious religion¹ reappears in Keats's sonnet 'Written in Disgust of Vulgar Superstition'. This poem, dated December 1816, may furnish additional evidence of his recent reading of Creech's version, and the Lucretian outburst against pagan ritualistic horrors is faintly echoed in Keats's protest at listening to sermons,

Surely the mind of man is closely bound
In some black spell.²

It remained, however, for Shelley to take up the cudgels in true Lucretian fashion against the oppressive phantoms of Superstition.

In the realm of mythology one of the few characteristics which Lucretius left his denatured Gods was a tranquillity of soul and residence:

For whatsoever's *Divine* must live in Peace,
In undisturb'd and everlasting Ease:
Nor care for Us, from fears and dangers free,
Sufficient to its own Felicity.³

And Keats when treating the pagan divinities reiterates this teaching:

Real are the dreams of Gods, and smoothly pass
Their pleasures in a long immortal dream,⁴

and again makes Coelus recall it in *Hyperion*:

Divine ye were created, and divine
In sad demeanour, solemn, undisturbed,
Unruffled, like high Gods, ye liv'd and ruled.⁵

Moreover, the one mortal whom Lucretius wished to raise to the skies prefigures in his colossal energies and his dispatching of phantoms the heavenly emissaries in Milton and, beyond this, touches the verbal portrait of Hyperion in at least three respects. Epicurus, as Sir Thomas Browne might say, is pyramidally extant in these lines:

Long time Men lay opprest with slavish Fear,
Religion's Tyranny did domineer,
Which being plac'd in Heaven look'd proudly down,
And frighted abject Spirits with her Frown.
At length a mighty one of Greece began.

¹ Note the lines in the Cybele passage:

The *Vulgar* fear, and all with Reverence bow.
Concerning her, *fond Superstition* frames
A thousand odd Concerts, etc....

Creech, p. 52.

Again, p. 142:

They are intrapt, they bind their *slavish* Chain
And *sink* to their Religious Fears again.

Especially see *Creech*, p. 119, on Vulgar beliefs, and p. 142, on Superstition. The famous 'tantum religio potuit suadere malorum', *Lucr.* i, 101, comes out in *Creech*, p. 5, as *Such Dwellish Acts Religion could persuade!*

² ll 5-6. *De Selincourt*, p. 351. See also his Notes, p. 556.

³ *Creech*, p. 3. Also cp. p. 53:

For every Deity must live in Peace
In undisturbed and everlasting Ease.
The *Gods* must live at Ease, not look below,
Free from all *meddling* Cares, from *Hate* and *Love*.

p. 141:

pp. 143-4:

...the blest abodes,
The *quiet* Mansions of the happy *Gods*.

⁴ *Lamia*, i, 126-7.

⁵ *Hyperion*, i, 329-31. Also cp. *Endymion*, iii, 23 ff.

T'assert the natural Liberty of Man,
 By senseless Terrors and vain Fancies led
 To slavery; *streight the conquer'd Fantoms fled.*
 Not the fam'd stories of the Deity
 Not all the Thunder of the threatning Sky
 Could stop his rising Soul; thro' all he past
 The strongest Bounds that powerful Nature cast:
 His vigorous and active Mind was hurl'd
 Beyond the flaming limits of *this* World
 Into the mighty Space, and there did see
 How things begin, what can, what cannot be.
 How all must die, all yield to fatal force
 What steady limits bound their natural course;
 He saw all this and brought it back to us.¹

Here perhaps, is the Promethean fire with which Keats relumed the dead
 Gods of Mythology and gave 'blazing Hyperion' his glory:

... before
 The quavering thunder thereupon had ceas'd
 His voice leapt out, despite of godlike curb,
 To this result: 'O dreams of day and night!...
 O lank-eared Phantoms of black-weeded pools
 Why do I know ye?...
 Even here, into my centre of repose
 The shady visions come to domineer
 Insult, and blind, and stifle up my pomp...
 Over the fiery frontier of my realms
 I will advance a terrible right arm
 Shall scare that infant thunderer, rebel Jove,
 And bid old Saturn take his throne again'...
 So at Hyperion's words the Phantoms pale
 Bestirr'd themselves.²

But if their treatment of god-like men and men-like gods was parallel,
 Keats and Lucretius were diametrically opposed on the subject of the
 sentimental. With severe Roman dignity Lucretius could exclaim:

Tis pleasant, when the Seas are rough, to stand
 And view another's danger, safe at Land:
 Not 'cause he's troubled, but 'tis sweet to see
 Those Cares and Fears, from which ourselves are free.³

¹ Creech, pp. 3-4.

² *Hyperion*, I, 234-56. By the irony that attends earnest efforts it may be that when Lucretius was occupied with explaining the nature of thunder and disproving Jove's control over natural phenomena, he may have suggested Keats's creation of the rebellious Gods. Thus Creech, pp. 197-8:

For if these Bolts were thrown by *Gods* above,
 Or if they were the *proper Arms* of *Jove*
 Why do the *daring Wicked* still provoke,
 Why still *sin* on secure from *Thunder's* stroke?
 Why are not such shot thro, and plac'd on high,
 As sad examples of Impiety...
 Why doth he suffer this; why not prepare,
 And keep his *useful Arms* for times of War?
 Lest some *Gigantick Impious Rebels* rise,
 And *unprovided* He should lose the *Skies*.

The Titans certainly numbered Lucretius among their members here.

³ Creech, p. 35.

But when a similar instance was to be dealt with in *Endymion* Keats's emotions directed this conduct of the old man:

I beheld the wreck
The final gulping; the poor struggling souls.
...and thus...did I sit
Writhing with pity...
And I was gazing on the surges prone,
With many a scalding tear and many a groan.¹

In another well-known passage Keats allowed his sentimentalism to run wild while he provided a brief for the anti-science nature-enthusiasts:

Do not all charms fly
At the mere touch of cold philosophy?
There was an awful rainbow once in heaven:
We know her woof, her texture; she is given
In the dull catalogue of common things.
Philosophy will clip an Angel's wings,
Conquer all mysteries by rule and line,
Empty the haunted air, and gnomed mine—
Unweave a rainbow, as it erewhile made
The tender-person'd Lamia melt into a shade.²

Now, perhaps it will be apparent that Lucretian doctrine is one of the systems of thought being assailed here. For the catalogue of things is the sum of what the 'Nature of Things' explains, and the conquering of all mysteries by rule and line whether by those of the carpenter or the logician,³ the emptying of the haunted air and the gnomed mine⁴ and the unweaving of the rainbow⁵ is the business which the poetry of Lucretius

¹ *Endymion*, III, 658-68.

² *Lamia*, II, 229-38. The two most recent attempts to speak well of Keats's meaning in this passage will be found in *P.M.L.A.* (1935), I, 550-61, and in *E.L.H.* (1935), II, 322-6.

³ See *Creech*, p. 6:

These Fears, that Darkness that o'respreads our Souls
Day can't disperse, but those *Eternal Rules*
Which from firm Premises true *Reason* draws.
And a deep insight into *Nature's* laws.
Well then, let this as the first *Rule* be laid, etc.,

and cp. p. 37. Note the carpenter's rule and line, *Creech*, pp. 117-18:

But lastly, as in *Building*, if the Line
Be not *exact*, and *strait*, the *Rule Decline*,
Or *Level false*, how *vain* is the *Design*!
Uneven, an *ill-shap't* and *tottering Wall*
Must rise, this part must *sink*, that part must fall,
Because the *Rules* were false that fashion'd All.

and of Epicurus, who dismissed the fables of the Cretan bull and Hydra, note p. 140:

Well then, that *Man*, who thus reform'd our *Souls*,
That slew these *Monsters*, not by *Arms*, but *Rules*.
Shall We, ingrateful We, not think a God?

⁴ Note *Creech*, p. 208 on *Averni*:

Lest you should fancy these the *Gates of Hell*,
That there the *Smutty Gods*, and *Manes* dwell...
But that's *absurd*, *irrational* and *vain*,
Come, understand the Cause, for I'll explain, etc.

⁵ Cp. *Creech*, pp. 201-2:

And when the *adverse Sun's* bright *Beauties* flow,
And strike *thick* clouds, they paint the gawdy *Bow*.

Rainbow.

with 'the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science' undertakes. And Keats with the petulance which the moment of the viper-woman's disenchantment seemed to demand, assailed coldly analytic science as the one shape of the demon of the absolute which he could not abide—not because of its false premises and inconclusive evidence, but because it limited the other demons of his imagination.

There were riper moments of judgement, however, when Keats was reconciled to reality, when he more justly equated the actual with the fanciful, and when the value of a knowledge of fact as well as an indulgence in fiction was apparent to him. A year before writing *Lamia* he could assert,

I find that I can have no enjoyment in the World but continual drinking of Knowledge—I find there is no worthy pursuit but the idea of doing some good for the world...there is but one way for me—the road lies through application study and thought.¹

It is here that the road of sensation begins to rise to the heights of wisdom. For even if Keats did not reach the peak of Mount Horeb he was granted the vision, and in *Hyperion* the observation of the truth if not the beauty of life had supreme importance:

For to bear all naked truths,
And to envisage circumstance, all calm,
That is the top of sovereignty!²

This was the ideal security which Lucretius had proclaimed, and which Shelley, remembering his Latin text, had quoted extensively in the notes to *Queen Mab*. In the memory of Keats the idea remained as worded by Creech:

But above all, 'tis pleasantest to get
The top of high *Philosophy*, and sit
On the calm, peaceful, flourishing head of it;
Whence we may view, deep, wonderous deep below,
How poor mistaken *Mortals* wandering go,
Seeking the path to *Happiness*; Some aim
At Learning, Wit, Nobility, or Fame:
Others with Cares and Dangers vex each hour,
To reach the top of Wealth, and Sovereign Power.³

In these more comprehensive moments Keats approached the work of Lucretius and in the high homage which genius pays to genius he treasured up memories of the Roman's achievement for his own use, and drew from thence his more mature concept of purposeful art:

¹ *Letters*, p. 134.

² *Hyperion*, II, 203-5. Douglas Bush, 'Notes on Keats's Reading', *P.M.L.A.* (1935), I, 802, relates these lines to similar passages in *The Excursion*. Wordsworth's knowledge of Lucretius was, it should be noted again, extensive.

³ Creech, p. 35.

Sure not all
Those melodies sung into the world's ear
Are useless: sure a poet is a sage;
A humanist, physician to all men.¹

For Lucretius meant his poem, as Professor Herford says,

as a helping hand to lift mankind to his own security. His heart went out to men as a physician, not coldly diagnosing their disease, but eager to cure them.²

However resentful some occasions found Keats of poetry which has a palpable design upon the reader, there was a respectfulness and attentiveness in his contacts with art and temperaments different from his own which helped him to increase his own stature. While the profound sadness of Lucretius derives from his poignant sense of cosmic perishing and decay, that of Keats springs from a realization of thwarted personal hopes and desires. Both poets perceived the bitter within the sweet whether in the course of love,³ or in the world's flowers, or in the shrine of Melancholy within the very temple of Delight.

In sum, Keats's encounter with Lucretian poetry and doctrine through the medium of Creech's version was a profitable experience for the young poet. None of the phrasal and conceptual similarities which have been quoted here need be pressed too far, yet the totality of resemblances testifies once again to the range and alertness of Keats's reading. This is another instance of the way in which the classic of the past may prehend the romantic of the present, and the lines which Keats wrote to Reynolds relate in part how in this fashion seeming opposites are reconciled and creation begins:

When man has arrived at a certain ripeness in intellect any one grand and spiritual passage serves him as a starting-post towards all 'the two-and-thirty Palaces'. How happy is such a voyage of conception, what delicious diligent Indolence!... But the Minds of Mortals are so different and bent on such diverse journeys that it may at first appear impossible for any common taste and fellowship to exist between two or three under these suppositions. It is however quite the contrary. Minds would leave each other in contrary directions, traverse each other in numberless points, and at

¹ *The Fall of Hyperion*, I, 187-90.

² *Op. cit.* p. 26.

³ *Op. Creech*, p. 133:

...whilst Lovers Arms
Shall clasp their Dears, whilst they behold their Charms
Strait Doubts arise, their careful Mind's employed
Which *Sweets* must first be rifled, which enjoy'd:
What they desir'd, they hurt; and 'midst the bliss
Raise pain,

with *Endymion*, II, 821-4:

...now while I clasp
Thee thus, and weep for fondness—I am pain'd
Endymion: woe! woe! is grief contain'd
In the very deeps of pleasure, my sole life?

last greet each other at the journey's end. An old Man and a child would talk together and the old Man be led on his path and the child left thinking.¹

Thus, perhaps, Keats came upon Lucretius, and in his company received that body of images and thoughts which was to serve as the key to a goodly number of the two-and-thirty Palaces.

JOHN HENRY WAGENBLASS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS. U.S.A.

¹ *Letters*, p. 103.

MEDIEVAL AND MODERN SENSIBILITY

NOWHERE in the *Confessions* or his correspondence does Rousseau explain why he christened his heroine Julie *la nouvelle Héloïse*, and except for a brief note by Chateaubriand in *Le Génie du Christianisme*¹ no attempt has been made, so far as I know, to compare the letters of the famous medieval lovers with those of the modern Héloïse. In Rousseau's novel there is but one reference to the Héloïse of history. Claire, writing to her idol Julie, exclaims: 'Tu fus amante comme Héloïse, te voilà dévote comme elle: plaise à Dieu que ce soit avec plus de succès'.² Now, but for this allusion, one might very well attribute Rousseau's choice of subtitle to the caprice of an author anxious to attract the public by the lure of a well-known name which, for the sophisticated and sentimental readers of his time, already held glamorous associations. It is indeed significant that in 1758, the year in which Rousseau announces the completion of his novel, Colardeau had just published his celebrated adaptation of Pope's *Eloisa*. Yet was not the analogy very slight? No doubt, Saint-Preux and Julie, like the unhappy Abélard and Héloïse, were passionate and faithful lovers cheated of their birthright by an unkind destiny: it is also true that Saint-Preux was Julie's tutor, a relationship which finds its parallel in the medieval episode. In both cases, too, the separation results in a series of letters. Here, however, the analogy apparently ceases, for what further resemblance can be drawn between the situation of the twelfth-century monk and nun and that of the eighteenth-century hero and heroine?

Before setting out to answer that question it may not be inopportune to recall the main incidents in the tragic experience of Abélard and Héloïse. We discover Pierre Abélard, at the age of thirty-five, already famous as a professor of philosophy and as a minor poet in Paris. Here he meets Héloïse, the niece of a canon named Fulbert. Educated by the nuns of Argenteuil, Héloïse shares her uncle's admiration for the talents of Abélard and embarks on a learned correspondence with the master. Soon these letters become less and less concerned with philosophy and more and more with love. Abélard declares his passion which the zealous Fulbert unwittingly abets by accepting Abélard's offer to lodge in his house. Fulbert, who is proud of his niece's learning, begs the doctor to give her lessons, never dreaming that the two could be attracted to each other by anything beyond scholarship. Abélard and Héloïse consummate their

¹ 2e Partie, Livre III, Ch. v.

² Ed. Flammarion, II, 103.

love and, in time, what has been the gossip of the town reaches Fulbert's ears. Abélard is obliged to leave and the girl, to her delight, realizes that she is with child.¹ Disguised as a nun she is smuggled by her lover to his sister's house in Brittany where Héloïse gives birth to a son, Astrolabe. To placate the rage of Fulbert, Abélard proposes to marry his niece, a step which of course spells professional ruin. As a married man he would have to renounce all hope of preferment. Knowing this, Héloïse violently dissuades her lover. In her eyes he is committing a crime against humanity, which depends for guidance on his genius. She herself is proud to be the mistress of such a man. However, Abélard's conscience gives him no rest and, as a sort of compromise, he marries Héloïse in secret, afterwards sending her to the convent of Argenteuil, though not of course as a novice. Meanwhile Fulbert and his friends, convinced that Abélard's cunning scheme is to make Héloïse a nun and thus to break off the marriage, execute a terrible revenge. Abélard is surprised at night by two of Fulbert's hirelings and shamefully mutilated. Abélard orders Héloïse to take the veil and he himself becomes a monk at St Denis.

He now enters upon a career of strife and humiliation. Hounded from place to place by his theological enemies, he finally takes refuge in a lonely spot near the abbey of Clairvaux then governed by the monk Bernard. Followed by a faithful group of disciples, Abélard founds a small monastery to which he gives the name of Paraclete. Soon he is embroiled with Bernard in theological disputes which lead to his departure from the Paraclete. Abélard is now superior of St Gildas de Ruys in the diocese of Vannes, in Brittany. The house is notorious for its disorder. To add to his sorrows he learns that Héloïse, with other nuns, has been driven from Argenteuil. To these women he offers the Paraclete as a new home. Here, by her sweetness and holy living, Héloïse earns the love and respect of all who meet her. During this time Abélard fights a losing battle with the fierce brothers of St Gildas who try on several occasions to take his life. It is now that the correspondence with Héloïse begins. The two had seen each other on the occasions of Abélard's visits to the Paraclete where Héloïse is now superior. In this capacity, apart from the fact that she is Abélard's wife, she has the right to that spiritual consolation which a director owes to the nuns under his governance. In this sense she writes, therefore, to Abélard. But soon the tone of her letters changes and the reproaches of the neglected superior yield place to

¹ *The Letters of Héloïse and Abélard*, ed. Chapman. Translated by C. K. Scott-Moncrieff, p. 12: 'Not long after this, the girl found that she had conceived and with the greatest exultation, wrote to me on the matter at once.' All the quotations in this article are taken from this edition.

the passionate accents of the woman abandoned by her husband and lover. The tenor of Abélard's replies irritates her by its professional mansuetude and she no longer attempts to restrain her anger, love and grief. Héloïse confesses now that she is chaste only in deed: the piety which the world so much admires hides a heart consumed with passion and regret. Abélard, in reply,¹ exhorts her to conquer these unholy thoughts, to throw herself on the mercy of God and to carry out her spiritual duties with fidelity. Héloïse, realizing that in Abélard the priest has driven out the lover and anxious at all costs not to lose contact with him, humbly writes as a superior to her director begging him to draw up a rule for the guidance of her Community. Thus Abélard's final letters, the seventh and eighth, are concerned with pastoral matters touching on the origin of nuns and their proper governance.

Meanwhile, Bernard had felt it his duty to bring Abélard before an ecclesiastical court because of certain heresies contained in his writings. He is excommunicated and his books condemned to the flames. Having done this duty, Bernard causes the ban to be lifted and gets Abélard admitted to the abbey of Cluny. But his health was now shattered and shortly afterwards he died in the priory of Saint Marcel at Châlon sur Saône, aged 63. Twenty-one years later, in 1163, Héloïse died at the Paraclete where her ashes were laid beside those of her husband.

Rousseau evidently thought that there was more than a superficial resemblance between this sad story and that of his romantic lovers. But is it true to say with Claire that Julie loved like Héloïse? Whilst there is no indication that Héloïse ever made the least attempt to resist the passionate wooing of Abélard, Julie's early letters betray a prolonged struggle between love and virtue. Still, it is clear from Claire's letter which we have quoted that Rousseau intends us to see a parallel between the two histories. Julie, as did Héloïse, transcends her original fault and indeed, because of it, acquires not merely glory but sainthood. She is, moreover, stronger finally than Héloïse who, according to Claire, was not a successful *dévot*e. That is borne out by the letter in which Héloïse tells Abélard of her 'wretched soul' and the emotions that enslave it.² In the language of passionate despair, she vividly depicts her obsessions, the licentious images which continue to haunt her in the very sanctuary where she vainly offers up her prayers for escape. 'For a long time thou, like many others, hast been deceived by my simulation, so as to mistake hypocrisy for religion; and thus, strongly recommending thyself to our prayers, what I expect from thee thou demandest from me. Do not,

¹ Letter v.

² Letter iv. p. 65.

I beseech thee, presume so highly of me, nor cease praying to assist me. Do not deem me healed, nor withdraw the grace of thy medicine. Do not believe me to be not in want, nor delay to succour my necessity. Do not think this strength, lest I fall before thou hold up the falling.' Héloïse does not seek the crown of sanctity: she will be only too pleased if God accords her a humble niche in Heaven. 'I do not seek the crown of victory: it is enough if I can escape danger.'

Héloïse's sole anxiety is to keep the love of Abélard; the love of God is a secondary matter. 'But in the whole period of my life, I have ever feared to offend thee rather than God, I seek to please thee more than Him. Thy command brought me, not the love of God, to the habit of religion.'¹ In her first letter to Abélard, what tortures her is not the fear of having sinned against the Almighty with Whom she is bitterly indignant but the intolerable thought that Abélard may hold her at least morally responsible for his dreadful shame. Therefore she begs him to remember that now, as always, her only thoughts have been for him. If she has been the unwilling instrument of his undoing, Abélard must judge her not by what has happened but by her intentions, which were coloured over by her love for him.² He, on the other hand, she knows, was drawn to her by desire and not love. Yet Héloïse sets him on such a plane that this seems natural and in no way does it diminish her ardour. Her 'crime' lies in the fact that she is a woman, doomed by her sex to be the cause of man's sorrows. 'Unhappy that I am, born to be the cause of so great a crime! O constant bane of women, greatest against the greatest men. Whereupon is it written in the Proverbs to beware of women.'³ Her only consolation is that, unlike Job's wife, she was not a consenting party to her husband's ruin. Yet though her heart is innocent of guilt in the affair of Abélard's mutilation, nevertheless Héloïse admits that by 'ministering to the delight of carnal snares, I then deserved that which I now bewail, and the sequel is made a fitting punishment of my previous sins'.

Let us now observe the contrast between this attitude of mind and that of the modern Héloïse. The love of Julie for Saint-Preux is the passion of a strong-minded woman for a romantic but feeble soul. The philosopher in this case is not Saint-Preux, but Julie d'Étange. Indeed, it is because she is so 'raisonnable' that she succumbs, where a girl less sure of herself would have confided in her mother and thus avoided temptation. But as Claire points out, Julie wants to make a lapse impossible whilst yet retaining the honour of struggling. Her former governess Chaillot, to whom Julie always refers with active dislike, had

¹ Letter iv, p. 66.

² Letter ii, pp. 47-8.

³ Letter iv, p. 64.

shrewdly foreseen that if Julie once departed from her principles she would be lost. 'Le premier soupir de ton cœur fera le destin de ta vie.'¹ To protect her virtue, Julie first throws herself on the chivalry of the voluptuous Saint-Preux, and for a time lives in the illusion that they can continue indefinitely as Platonic lovers. Naturally, Saint-Preux quickly tires of this impossible role and, with a sigh of relief, agrees to entrust their common destiny to Julie. She, meanwhile, plays with fire and, to her alarm, notes the effect on the ardent Saint-Preux of the first kiss she playfully accords him. It is this *baiser mortel* which transforms Saint-Preux the chivalrous sighing lover of romance into the passionate, exigent lover of actuality.

Still reasonable and practical, Julie insists on his going away for a time and arranges for a method whereby they may correspond in secret. Now, in writing to her lover, she adopts a tone of maternal reproach and redoubles her filial attentions to her parents. She forces Saint-Preux to accept money and rebukes him severely for the unworthy prejudice which at first makes him refuse. Alone in the mountains of Le Valais, the poet-lover abandons himself to voluptuous dreams of Julie. 'Tous les arbres que je rencontrais vous prêtaient leur ombre, tous les gazons vous servaient de siège.'² To be perfect, Nature requires only the eternal presence of Julie who, during this time, realizes that her father will never consent to a *mésalliance* with her tutor. With the continued separation, the passion of both the lovers becomes more intense and the growing sense of hopelessness weakens Julie's defences. At this critical moment, she receives a despairing letter from Saint-Preux. Winter is approaching and the horror and desolation of his soul seem to be reflected in the bleakness of his natural surroundings. From his eyrie he can look down on Vevey and imagine Julie going about her daily tasks. In a lyrical, heart-rending appeal he begs her to throw up everything and come to him. Otherwise, he will take his own life.

Julie falls dangerously ill and her lover is recalled. She recovers only to learn that her father proposes to marry her to an old regimental comrade who had once saved his life. Now, regarding herself as a second Iphigénie, she yields to Saint-Preux. 'Il fallait donner la mort à l'auteur de mes jours, à mon amant ou à moi-même.'³ She sees herself, therefore, as the inevitable victim of too much sensibility. Tortured by remorse, Julie at this stage has full need of Claire's consoling letters. Julie, her friend insists, is really much more chaste than she herself who could never have struggled so long. Saint-Preux, for his part, tries to lull her

¹ Ed. cit. I, p. 39.² Ed. cit. I, p. 77.³ Ed. cit. I, p. 90.

conscience with the romantic doctrine that they are married in the sight of God. She is his 'froide et mystérieuse amante', his mystic bride.

But Julie is no Héloïse. She is incapable of glorying, as Héloïse did, in her action. She has none of Héloïse's adoration for her lover: in Julie's world only Julie must be adored. What really torments her is the knowledge that she has been false to her idea of herself. They are now, she tells Saint-Preux, merely ordinary lovers since they stooped to enjoy a pleasure which is within the reach of the vilest mortals, of people who are utterly incapable of conceiving love as they do. It is significant that Rousseau suggests not the slightest trace of irony in this expression of egotism. In her letters to Saint-Preux, Julie lectures him on jealousy and makes him promise, on his honour, to confide in her utterly.

So far, the situation of Julie and Saint-Preux has only a very superficial resemblance to that of Héloïse and Abélard. The tutor has seduced the pupil and the secret love affair is liable to be discovered at any moment. To this extent, Rousseau roughly follows the story of the original Héloïse. But in transposing his situations, he modernized them and, moreover, completely altered the characters of the lovers. For personal reasons, he now diverges more and more from the medieval story. In both cases there is an obstacle to marriage, but whereas Fulbert, Héloïse's avaricious uncle, would be only too delighted to have Abélard as a son-in-law, such an idea never occurs to Héloïse because of its inevitable effect on the career of her lover. Julie cannot marry Saint-Preux either, but for quite different reasons. Her father will not consent to her marriage with a *roturier*. He intends her for M. de Wolmar to whom he owes a great debt. In fact, as Julie bitterly puts it: 'Il s'aquitte a mes dépens'. Again, Julie has too much sensibility to cause her mother sorrow and is too good a daughter to disobey her father. In another sense too the positions are reversed, since Julie is always conscious of her social superiority to her lover. However much she talks about his 'natural merit' it is clear from a letter written long afterwards to Claire¹ that she regards marriage between Saint-Preux and an aristocrat as an advantage to the former.

Possibly, when he first conceived the character of Saint-Preux, Rousseau was influenced by memories of Abélard. Both lovers are poets, musicians and philosophers. But, though we gather that Saint-Preux is an author of some repute, he is so constantly overshadowed by Julie that it is difficult to remember that he has any existence apart from her. Abélard, on the contrary, is a brilliant figure in the world of philosophy

¹ Ed. cit. II, p. 237.

and letters, a man of noble birth with powerful friends. He does not fear Fulbert; but his sense of reality tells him that he owes the canon reparation for having abused his credulity and hospitality. That scruple is conspicuously absent from the mind of Saint-Preux. In every situation, Abélard dominates Héloïse and, in crises, he proves himself a man of action. The differences in the characters of the two men are reflected in their respective attitudes to the discovery of the love affair.

For various most interesting reasons, Rousseau recoils from a public exposure of Julie's lapse and its consequences. That indeed is a capital difference between the two stories. Of course, from the outset, Claire is aware of all the facts and indeed, through her letters, the reader is able to follow every step leading to the heroine's physical surrender and to know the intimate details which result from it. Saint-Preux's friend, Lord Edouard Bomston, also becomes a confidant and, of course, an ardent admirer of Julie's. In order to avert a duel which would have been fatal to her lover, she writes to Bomston confessing her relations with Saint-Preux, a dramatic but quite probable gesture which evokes Bomston's admiration. 'Vos deux âmes sont si extraordinaires qu'on n'en peut juger par les règles communes.'¹ But her father, the baron d'Étange, never knows the full extent of her intimacy with Saint-Preux though her mother eventually does. We gather from Claire that people are beginning to gossip, to such a point that if Julie's honour is to be saved her lover must go away. On the other hand, as a result of her father's brutality, she is not now enceinte. Here again we have a divergence from the situation of Héloïse which essentially affects their respective problems. To put it plainly, Rousseau balks a reality which would have completely ruined his projected idealization of Julie.

At this stage, Saint-Preux's unmanly despair stands out in sharp contrast to the energy of his mistress. Both Julie and Claire scold him for his weakness, and he meekly places himself under Julie's orders. During his absence in Paris, he gives further evidence of his instability and confesses to an escapade in a *maison close*. This is forgiven, but he is severely taken to task for his lack of moral fibre. Suddenly Julie discovers, however, that their love-letters have fallen into her mother's hands. Now there can be no question of continued resistance to her father's wish. The death of Mme d'Étange comes, apparently, as a warning from Heaven, and she asks Saint-Preux to give her back her liberty. All that her father knows, however, is that she has made a romantic promise to Saint-Preux not to marry without his permission.

¹ I, p. 158.

In reply to a bullying letter from the baron, the lover relinquishes his 'rights'. In a farewell letter Julie reveals the network of complications in which she is trapped. At every stage, it seems, Providence intervenes. God, to crown his mercies, grants her divine grace; for, as a result of the marriage ceremony, she undergoes a spiritual change. She will respect the sanctity of her vows to Wolmar.

It is probable that life is only as complicated as we like to make it. Julie and Saint-Preux, who are all sensibility, complicate it beyond reason. Every situation which calls for action is a torture to their sensitive and introspective minds. One cannot but reflect with a sense of irony that nothing is so difficult in this world as to follow the dictates of Rousseau's 'infallible guide', the individual conscience. It is not that the lovers have no help from outside. Does not Bomston generously offer them a house in Yorkshire and a position for Saint-Preux? But the honour of Julie's father is at stake since Wolmar has now lost most of his fortune, which makes it all the more urgent for the baron to pay his debt. Disarmed by her father's unusual tenderness, Julie gives up Saint-Preux. Héloïse, more passionate, more feminine and more natural, would not have regarded such a situation as a dilemma.

When, after the secret marriage to which Héloïse consented only to please her lover, Fulbert and his servants broke their promise and divulged the secret, his niece lied like a trooper. 'She began to anathematise to the contrary, and to swear that their story was altogether false. Whereby he being vehemently moved began to visit her with frequent contumely.'¹ In this situation Héloïse thinks only of her lover's interests, and here we have, in essence, the contrast between her character and Julie's. The latter never will admit to herself or to her lover that she succumbed from passion. 'Je me perdis pour vous sauver' is the burden of her early letters. Yet at one juncture she resolves to behave with the intrepidity of Héloïse. In her farewell letter to Saint-Preux, she tells him that she had intended to have a child and, by a public declaration before the pastor, to force her father's consent to her marriage. But from her conduct in other circumstances we may be allowed to doubt whether she possessed sufficient strength of will to carry out this plan.

But like Rousseau, whom she so closely resembles, Julie has a genius for explaining her actions and her abstention from action in every circumstance. What irritates the average reader is that her explanations are invariably plausible. She quails before the prospect of confessing to her father but makes it clear to us that, in any case, confession could

¹ Letter 1, p. 16.

have done her no good. And she has excellent reasons for not telling Wolmar about her former relations with Saint-Preux: when she finally does so it is because she suspects, nay is convinced, that her husband already knows. Her sensibility will not allow her to write to her lover about her marriage until it is an accomplished fact. No doubt this is, in effect, the most reasonable thing she could have done, yet her conduct springs, not from sense, but from moral cowardice. This, she and Rousseau mistake for sensibility. The fact is that Julie is no more capable of facing unpleasant truths than was Rousseau himself. And this trait, which recurs again and again in the *Confessions* and in the *Dialogues*, emerges also in Julie's early letters to her lover.

Before the lapse, Julie rebukes Saint-Preux in a phrase which is much more applicable to herself than to him. 'Les plaisirs du vice et l'honneur de la vertu', she writes, 'vous feraient un sort agréable.'¹ Now this hits off her own character very accurately though Rousseau would never have admitted it. Yet, unconsciously, the impression he ultimately gives us is of a woman of ardent temperament who lives in a constant illusion that because of her uniqueness she cannot be judged by ordinary standards even when she succumbs to a temptation to which all sensual creatures are exposed. In this respect she has not a shred of Héloïse's blunt honesty, for Héloïse cares not a farthing about her reputation.² We have seen too that Julie persists in regarding her lapse as a sacrifice. This of course is in harmony with the author's general plan of presenting extraordinary people in ordinary situations and of showing how a woman of rare sensibility and natural goodness could survive an experience which would have ruined a person of common clay. Indeed, because of that experience, Julie emerges from the ordeal spiritually unscathed and, moreover, spiritually perfect. For this we are prepared early in the novel. Saint-Preux, Claire and Bomston continually advertize Julie's rare qualities; and the whole of the second book is dedicated to the praise of Julie in the role of model wife, mother, châtelaine, and finally of the saint who, by the example of her life and death, converts the atheist Wolmar. What Rousseau can never see is that whilst Julie is constantly being reproached by her friends for her excessive humility she is in reality an inveterate egotist. Not one of her letters to Saint-Preux reflects the generous self-abandonment of Héloïse and her blindly

¹ I, p. 43.

² Letter II, p. 46: 'I call God to witness, if *Augustus*, ruling over the whole world, were to deem me worthy of the honour of marriage, and to confirm the whole world to me, to be ruled by me for ever, dearer to me and of greater dignity would it seem to be called thy strumpet than his empress.'

uncritical worship of Abélard. On the contrary, Julie, who coyly admits to being rather a *prêcheuse*, a charming *prêcheuse*, according to Claire and Saint-Preux, strikes the most indulgent reader as an insufferable nagger. As lovers, she and Saint-Preux remain individualists. The poet-lover sees his goddess on a pinnacle and bemoans the cruel fate which renders her inaccessible. Julie crams her letters with lectures on his sensuality and his weakness; contradicts him on matters of which she can have no possible knowledge; criticizes his style and reminds him constantly that the man who overcame the virtue of a Julie is privileged above common mortals. In a word, to justify her own weakness in having yielded to Saint-Preux, she spends the rest of her life trying to make him worthy of her. That Wolmar is also similarly indoctrinated, we know from his naïve remark: 'Le mari de Julie ne doit pas se conduire comme un autre homme'.¹

There is at first sight a parallel between the married Héloïse and Mme de Wolmar; but it disappears as we examine the Julie of the final phase. Both are forced into matrimony but from vastly different causes—Héloïse because she loves Abélard too well to stand in the way of his absurd scruples, and Julie because she has not the strength of will to override her father's wishes. Héloïse only consents on the understanding that the ceremony shall take place in secret so that when Fulbert breaks his word and publicly announces the marriage she is the first to call him a liar and to treat him publicly as a visionary. As she had wisely foreseen, her marriage, instead of easing the situation, aggravates it. To rescue her from her uncle's ill-treatment, Abélard sent his wife to the convent of Argenteuil where he was able to see her when he liked. Fulbert, convinced that this was a trick, avenged himself as we know. Héloïse, separated from her baby which was still in Brittany, tortured by the spectacle of her husband's grief, had now to undergo a supreme ordeal. Abélard, still blind to his wife's nobility of soul, yielding to an unworthy sentiment of jealousy, obliged her to take the veil and, as a crowning insult, insisted that her profession of vows should precede his own. This lack of faith wounded Héloïse more than his original request. 'And for that in this one thing thou shouldst have had little trust in me I vehemently grieved and was ashamed.'² But it is clear from her letters that the sanctity of the occasion produced in her nothing resembling that mystic change of heart experienced by Julie on her marriage to Wolmar. Héloïse sacrificed herself to Abélard and not to God; Julie, on the

¹ II, p. 98.

² Letter II, p. 48.

contrary, can write to Saint-Preux that she can think of him now without forgetting that she is the wife of another man.

Like Saint-Preux, Abélard is separated from Héloïse for a number of years during which time his wife brings lustre to the Paraclete by her prudence and virtue. But, by chance, Héloïse reads a letter written by Abélard to console a friend, to whom he recounts the misfortunes and temptations of his own life. Immediately, the slumbering flame of her passion is rekindled and in her distress she writes to Abélard with the result already mentioned. There is nothing in *La Nouvelle Héloïse* to equal this situation. Julie's director of conscience is the atheist Wolmar, who subjects Saint-Preux to an extraordinary test. He absents himself deliberately for several days, leaving his wife and her ex-lover to roam about the scenes of their former passion. For a moment, at Meillerie, they are tempted; but the crisis is averted by Julie so that to all appearance both are cured. The situation is so incredible as to leave one with the certainty that it must have had a parallel in Rousseau's own relations with Saint-Lambert and Mme d'Houdetôt or at least with Claude Anet and Mme de Warens. Viewed as a practical test of marital fidelity it is hardly to be recommended if only for the reason that the experiment is carried out with the full knowledge of the quondam lovers, who would have to be very hardened wretches indeed to commit a lapse under such cold-blooded circumstances. However, so satisfied is Wolmar that he arranges to make Saint-Preux the tutor of his children: henceforth husband, wife and ex-lover are to live together in perfect friendship and purity. This miracle has been achieved solely by Julie's gift of radiating love. We shall see in a moment that Wolmar's knowledge of the human heart is not entirely complete.

Héloïse's 'purification' was brought about by more natural means. It was indeed a logical extension of her passion for Abélard. Originally he had attracted her by his superb intellectual gifts: it was as a philosopher that she first fell in love with him and in all her subsequent relations the only thing that ever struck her as wrong was Abélard's unwillingness to live up to her conception of him as a great spiritual leader. Her own share in his happiness Héloïse had always regarded as of small account. It irritated her to think of a man of his genius tied by conjugal obligations which could only hamper his intellectual development. So when Abélard studiously refuses to discuss their former sexual relations and, on the contrary, speaks to her only as priest to abbess, her ideal vision of him is revived and she humbly realizes that he is no longer the husband of Héloïse. Indeed, there is little to show that she ever really 'repented'.

'I will hold back my hand therefore from writing what I cannot restrain my tongue from speaking. Would that the heart of the mourner were as ready to obey as the hand of the writer.' If Abélard will consent to write, even if it is only about professional matters, perhaps in time her grief will be assuaged and her mind directed to more worthy thoughts.

Perhaps Julie's case was harder, precisely because in Wolmar she could expect to discover no such incentive to holiness. And Saint-Preux, as she well knew, was notoriously weak. On the other hand, was not she herself a reservoir of natural goodness? Saint-Preux, writing to Bomston after the Wolmar test and its crisis at Meillerie, informs him gravely that Julie was sent from Heaven to show the world the excellence of which a human soul is capable in the obscurity of private life. Her fault, if it can be called a fault, has but served to illuminate her strength and courage. Her life is a unique model which few women would care to try to emulate but which all must admire. Yet when we turn to the letters written at this stage by Julie to Claire we have a dawning suspicion that there is a tiny flaw in the alabaster purity of the statue. Were these the sentiments of an ordinary woman, one might use the vulgar term jealousy to characterize the writer's state of mind. Incidentally a dash of common jealousy would have made Julie less inhumanly perfect, but Rousseau cannot for a moment admit the suspicion of such a weakness. Just as in the case of his own theft of the ribbon, so everything that in an ordinary mortal would be a fault becomes, if committed by an *âme sensible*, an added virtue. With his genius for sophistry, which is here communicated to his heroine, Rousseau contrives, in the incident of the projected marriage between Claire and Saint-Preux, to display a Julie unconsciously opposed to the union yet convinced that she is doing her utmost to realize it.

Claire and Saint-Preux have been spending the whole winter at the Wolmars' and, after her friend's departure, Julie twits her with being in love with Saint-Preux. She asks her if she is not alarmed at the danger of living under the same roof as their ex-tutor. 'Mon exemple ne te fait-il rien craindre pour toi?'¹ Now, quite apart from this rather surprising allusion to her own lapse, it is extraordinary of Julie to overlook the fact that there is absolutely no resemblance between the situation of Claire the marriageable widow, and her own former case. Yet, throughout the whole letter, she obstinately ignores this fact and harps morbidly on the danger accruing to Claire's virtue from Saint-Preux's society. With calm assurance, she proceeds to explain to her friend that, for all the

¹ II, p. 232.

latter's apparent jolliness, she is at heart a woman of ardent temperament. Indeed, she coolly remarks, her own lapse really saved Claire from the snares of love: in plain terms, not only did she sacrifice herself to save her lover, father and mother but also to save her friend. This is all, so to speak, by the way. With a certain maternal sternness, Julie gravely warns Claire of that over-confidence which was her own undoing and rebukes her for being ashamed of an honest sentiment that 'has only to be declared to be rendered innocent'.¹ And now, with admirable subtlety, she exposes, apparently in order to refute them, certain objections to the marriage between Claire and Saint-Preux which most probably would never otherwise have entered her friend's mind. Why, she asks, should Claire hesitate to raise Saint-Preux to her own social level by marrying him? Of course people will exclaim against a widow entering into matrimony again and with an 'adventurer'. But why pay attention to these 'sordid souls'? Another difficulty is that, under the circumstances, Claire will have to make the first overtures. However, Julie kindly offers to take charge of the negotiations and the adoring Claire eagerly replies: 'Gouverne et je serai docile'.²

Armed with this mission, Julie writes to Saint-Preux for the first time in seven years.³ The circumstances are piquant. Julie and Saint-Preux are now simply friends and it is in the role of a sister or a mother that she now proceeds to catechize her ex-lover on his present state of soul. She is full of anxiety for the success of her husband's plan. But, is it wise for a man of Saint-Preux's ardent and sensual nature to risk living under the same roof as Claire? And what of the servants? Is Saint-Preux quite certain that he will not bring 'disorder' into the household? After all, 'l'homme n'est pas fait pour le célibat', and Saint-Preux's record is hardly encouraging. She recalls the escapade in Paris, the outbreak at Meillerie. Indeed, the only way to protect Claire's innocence is to marry her. Julie now resumes the tactics which she used with Claire. Saint-Preux is reminded that social inequality is no real obstacle. It may be that deep down in his heart he may still harbour 'a reluctance to form new ties'. This sentiment he must at once crush for his own honour and Julie's peace of mind. In 'giving' him Claire she is giving him the better part of herself and—now for the crucial obstacle—Saint-Preux must not marry unless he is sure that he can love Claire as he loved Julie d'Étange. The answer she receives is that which she longed for. Claire, writes Saint-Preux, is charming but 'nos amours, nos premiers et uniques

¹ II, p. 236.² II, p. 251.³ Vol. II, 6e Partie, Lettre VI, pp. 267-77.

amours ne sortiront jamais de mon cœur'.¹ What would not the original Héloïse have given for such a confession from Abélard? Yet Saint-Preux is a failure as a spiritual doctor, since it is very evident from Julie's final letter to him that she has not attained Héloïse's detachment from earthly things. For the first time indeed, she is almost honest with herself for she admits that she has been living in an illusion. But we have only to recall the language used by Héloïse on a similar occasion to note the psychological contrast between the two women. Héloïse frankly told Abélard that she was a hypocrite and graphically described the turbulent desires which she kept hidden from the world. 'They preach that I am chaste who have not discovered the hypocrite in me. They make the purity of the flesh into a virtue, when it is a virtue not of the body but of the mind. Having some praise among men, I deserve none before God.'²

Julie, whose way of thinking is that of Rousseau himself, is incapable of such integrity of soul. She cannot see her own conduct in this clear fashion. Like Jean-Jacques, she lives in a land where there are no realities. This much she finally confesses, shortly before her death. 'Le pays des chimères est en ce monde le seul digne d'être habité et tel est le néant des choses que hors l'être existant par lui-même, il n'y a rien de beau que ce qui n'est pas.'³ There is no beauty even in happiness. 'Je suis trop heureuse; le bonheur m'ennuie.'⁴ Religion, for Julie then, is simply an escape from romantic ennui, the intolerable longing for the unknown. 'Malheur à qui n'a plus à désirer! il perd pour ainsi dire tout ce qu'il possède.' Julie has everything she desires. Could any other woman she asks, have more sensibility? Or better love her father, husband, children, friends or neighbours? Or be better loved by them? Lead a life more to her taste; be freer to choose another mode of living; enjoy better health; have more resources against ennui; more ties that link her with society? 'And yet in this world I live anxiously, my heart wants it knows not what.'⁵ That is why she takes refuge in a religion that is really quietism but a quietism which does not prevent her from fulfilling her worldly duties. 'Le Dieu que je sers est un Dieu clément, un père: ce qui me touche est sa bonté; elle efface à mes yeux tous ses autres attributs; elle est le seul que je conçois.' Such is the burden of Julie's swan-song.

Nowhere in the works of our author, not even in his *Émile*, does the contrast between the religious philosophy of Rousseau and his orthodox opponents stand out more sharply than in the above letter. The passionate

¹ II, p. 278.

⁴ II, p. 297.

² Letter IV, p. 66.

⁵ II, pp. 297-8.

³ II, p. 297.

sensibility of Julie's language distracts attention from the underlying fallacy of her pleading. Did she possess one atom of Héloïse's honesty and humility she could not fail to see that the real cause of her spiritual dissatisfaction, of her ennui, is her persisting love for Saint-Preux. Actually, she is exactly in the state of mind described by Héloïse in her first letter to Abélard. Yet, like Rousseau, Julie is temperamentally unable to face reality. In her humble way, Héloïse sees herself as she is, a woman in love who turns, not to God, but to her lover for comfort. As it happens, Abélard is at the same time her spiritual director and by forcing her to see him only in that light, he may lead Héloïse's troubled soul away from the things of the world. Julie, as a Protestant, is accustomed, in such matters of conscience, to seek counsel directly from her Maker through prayer. She has none of Héloïse's humility though her friends continually protest that she is over-humble. Actually, like Rousseau, she is a rank egotist, and if she communes with the Almighty it does not follow that she needs help against temptation. Communion of this sort is merely a delicious occasion for pouring out her surplus emotion. *'Il ne me faut des séances ni fréquentes ni longues. Quand la tristesse m'y suit malgré moi, quelques pleurs versés devant celui qui console, soulagent mon cœur à l'instant. Mes réflexions ne sont jamais amères ni douloureuses: mon repentir même est exempt d'alarmes. Mes fautes me donnent moins d'effroi que de honte. J'ai des regrets et non des remords.'*¹

On her death-bed Julie, if possible, reveals added perfections, and her views on religion elicit admiring cries of wonder and delight from her pastor. *'Je croyais vous instruire et c'est vous qui m'instruisez.'*² But it may be argued that Rousseau wilfully destroys this lovely vision by the love confession made by Julie in her final epistle to Saint-Preux. By no means, for we realize more and more that her swan-song was completely sincere though its sincerity is born of a remarkable superiority complex. Rousseau would argue that whilst it is fitting and natural for an Héloïse to confess that her love for Abélard constitutes a barrier between God and herself, a woman of Julie's natural goodness may continue to harbour such a love without shame or weakness. Thanks to the special grace of God, Julie is removed from this world at the moment of complete perfection. And her love, which she believed to be dead but was only dormant, reveals its presence only when it is no longer to be feared. *'Il me soutient quand mes forces m'abandonnent; il me ranime quand je meurs.'*³ During all her married life, however, she has always

¹ II, pp. 299-300.² II, p. 319.³ II, p. 343.

lived and thought blamelessly. 'La vertu me reste sans tâche et l'amour m'est resté sans remords.'¹ In short, she has had all the pleasures, perhaps not of vice, but of something very like *la volupté*, with all the honours of virtue.

This is not the final expression of her egotism which, in the guise of a beautiful yet ruthless sensibility, has already enslaved all who came within its influence—Saint-Preux, Claire, Wolmar, Bomston, children and servants. Of this Rousseau is quite unconscious, since the character of Julie is but a projection of his own *amour de soi*. He can therefore see nothing abnormal in the following situation. The marriage between Julie and Saint-Preux, thwarted by the jealous prejudice of an imperfect civilization, is to be consummated vicariously in the union of Claire and Julie's former lover. 'Remember', she writes, 'that you still have another Julie and do not forget what you owe to her. You are each about to lose the half of your life; marry in order to preserve the other. It is the only means you will have of surviving me whilst serving my family and my children. Why can I not invent still closer bonds to unite all that are dear to me? How shall you ever be able to speak to each other without a mutual tenderness? No, Claire and Julie will be so completely fused that it will not be possible to separate them in your heart. Hers will give you back all you felt for her friend: she will be its confidante and object. You will be happy through her who remains to you without ceasing to be faithful to her whom you have lost.'² And after death, Julie and Saint-Preux will be eternally united. 'Je meurs dans cette douce attente: trop heureuse d'acheter au prix de ma vie le droit de t'aimer toujours sans crime.'³ In this final state there is no further talk of Claire: presumably, having served her purpose, she fades out of the picture.

I doubt whether in the literature of any country it is possible to find a more naïve and monstrous conception of love. The idea of a passion transcending death is of course a familiar theme. Poets and novelists have depicted in a hundred ways the constancy of the bereaved and the hope of a reunion in Heaven. These are human and natural sentiments. It required, however, the strange and twisted imagination of a Rousseau to conceive the amazing egotism which, from beyond the grave, is determined to control the destinies of the living. Julie, dying, cannot face the idea of relinquishing Saint-Preux to her dearest friend. Her unquiet spirit must have hostages in the world it has left. Claire and Saint-Preux must still remain the slaves of Julie. In life she could permit

them to have no individual existence and that domination she resolves to ensure for the rest of their mortal lives. Always between their souls there will be the memory of Julie, without whose intermediacy they shall have no contact.

This dreadful legacy is the supreme gesture of her *âme sensible*; for Rousseau, beyond question, it is Julie's crowning glory. But the symbolic marriage, happily, does not take place and it is Claire and not Saint-Preux who is the obstacle. In her exaltation she finds a reason for her action which is worthy of Julie herself. 'J'ai eu de l'amour pour vous, je l'avoue', she tells Saint-Preux, 'peut-être en ai-je encore; je ne le sais ni ne le veux savoir. On s'en doute, je ne m'en fâche ni ne m'en soucie. Mais voici ce que j'ai à vous dire et que vous devez bien retenir; c'est qu'un homme qui fut aimé de Julie d'Étange et pourrait se résoudre à en épouser une autre n'est à mes yeux qu'un indigne et un lâche que je tiendrais à déshonneur d'avoir pour ami.' For Claire, the spirit of Julie hovers over the little group at Clarens. One wonders, with a certain malice, whether it really applauded her friend's renunciation. After all, it is rather aggravating even for an angel to be outdone in sensibility by one's best friend and most adoring disciple!

La Nouvelle Héloïse is Rousseau's tribute to the power and the delight of sentiment. 'O sentiment, sentiment!' exclaims Saint-Preux, 'douce vie de l'âme.' Yet when we observe the havoc wrought by Julie in the small group which she governs at Clarens nothing seems more exhausting than the sentimental life as practised by these adepts of Rousseau. To distinguish it from what the *philosophes* call sentiment, Jean-Jacques defines it as 'un épanchement affectueux dans le sein de l'amour ou de l'amitié'. Actually the impression one carries away from the commerce of his *âmes sensibles*, both lovers and friends, is one of restless emotional and intellectual activity. Each tries to outdo the other in sensibility. Like children eager to please their taskmistress, the undisputed judge in questions of the feelings, they spend their lives interfering with each other's liberty. In his preface, Rousseau warns us that his hero and heroine are extraordinary people; but all his characters are extraordinary because they regard sentiment as the soul of existence. Even the cold and rational Wolmar is only cold and rational on the surface. His friendship for Saint-Preux expresses itself in an irresistible urge to remould him according to his own idea of the perfect friend of the husband of a Julie. For Rousseau, sensibility implies the loss of individual liberty and inevitably, as we see from *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, submission to the influence of a stronger, i.e. a more sentimental soul. Julie makes that

plain in describing the charms of life in the little society at Clarens. It lies, she explains, in that 'ouverture du cœur qui met en commun toutes les pensées et qui fait que chacun, se sentant tel qu'il doit être, se montre à nous tel qu'il est'. In writing *La Nouvelle Héloïse* Rousseau, as he confesses, depicted an ideal society. None knew better than he how strongly men cling to their individuality and how adverse they are from sharing their secret emotions with their fellows. He knew from bitter experience the attitude of society towards the *âme sensible*, and when we see in his novel to what extremes he was prepared to carry sensibility, we are constrained to admit that society, on the whole, was right.

F. C. GREEN.

CAMBRIDGE.

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY JUDITH-DRAMA

THIS study is based upon a MS.¹ consisting of 345 lines of a German Judith-drama. The Prologue (ll. 1-74)—from which it is clear that the drama was to cover the whole of the Apocryphal Book of Judith—and an introductory section (ll. 75-265) are extant. This first part deals with King Nabuchodonosor's expedition against King Arphaxat, the sending out of Holofernes against the neighbouring peoples, and the announcement in Bethulia of his approach. Then there is a gap of two or more pages in the MS.; after this the fragment concludes with 80 lines, dealing with Achior's capture by the Bethulians, Holofernes' preparations for besieging Bethulia, and his order to cut off the city's water supply.

A consideration of the contents of the fragment immediately suggests the conclusion that the MS. is part of a hitherto unknown drama, as none of the other early Judith-dramas² includes the introductory chapters of the Book of Judith, i.e. the Arphaxat-episode. The Humanists who dramatized the Judith-story—the first was Sixt Birck, in 1534,³ the second Joachim Greff, in 1536—confined themselves to that part of the Apocryphal book which deals with the siege of Bethulia by Holofernes, thus dramatizing only the story of the heroine.

Not until the middle of the seventeenth century was the Arphaxat-story made the subject of a stage play. *Tragoedia mundi*, the voluminous play of Johannes Oehen which was performed on two successive days in 1651, in the Mühleplatz in Lucerne, includes 'Untergang König Arphaxats, Hochmut König Nabuchodonosors, Wütereii Holofernis und Starkmütigkeit der Helden Judith'.⁴ Eberle has shown that Oehen's drama does not correspond in any way either to the figure of Judith which was included in the Lucerne Easter-play of 1597 or to the Jesuit drama of *Judith* which was played at Lucerne in 1650. 'Das Jesuitenspiel beginnt da, wo der Feind vor der Stadt steht... Oehen aber setzt der "Judith" den Akt vom Untergang König Arphaxats voraus... Die Jesuiten-Judith ist allezeit Mittelpunkt der Handlung. Die Bürgerspiel-

¹ The MS., which extends to 16 pages, is in the possession of the *Gesellschaft für Theatergeschichte*, Berlin, to which I am greatly indebted for the permission to publish it here.

² Cp. E. Purdie, *The Story of Judith in German and English Literature* (*Bibl. de la Revue de Litt. comparée*, 39), Paris, 1927; O. Baltzer, *Judith in der deutschen Literatur* (*Stoff- u. Motiugeschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 7), Berlin and Leipzig, 1930.

³ Greff's Judith-drama is generally assumed erroneously to be the earliest version, as the date of the first edition of Birck's *Judith* (Augsburg, 1539) is assumed to be the year of its origin and first performance; but cp. H. Levinger, *Augsburger Schültheater* (*Theater und Drama*, 2), Berlin, 1931, p. 10.

⁴ MSS. fol. 186, Bürgerbibliothek, Lucerne. There are two contemporary copies (MSS. fol. 187 a/b) in the same library.

Judith ist nur ein kleiner Teil im grossen Spiel. Das zeigt deutlich genug, wie sehr Oehen in der mittelalterlichen Spielüberlieferung Luzerns wurzelt, wenn er auch noch so hoch in den Barock hineingewachsen ist.¹

The question is whether there is a connexion between Oehen's dramatization of the Arphaxat-story—hitherto the earliest known version—and the Judith-fragment here printed.

Every drama is written for a particular type of theatre—the stage of its own day. Two plays based upon the same story, but written in different periods, can only be compared after consideration of the conditions of the theatre and the stage in these two periods. The drama of which the Judith-fragment is a part and Oehen's *Tragoedia mundi* were written for two different types of theatre, separated from each other by at least a hundred years. In the history of the theatre in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, a difference of a hundred years is not absolutely fixed and measurable. In this period the theatre was still in the making and was developing from a multiplicity of entirely different types; and either a decisive change in form took place, or, alternatively, under certain local influences, the early form of stage was preserved essentially unchanged.

The Fragment no doubt calls for a multiple stage which places before the spectator simultaneously a number of widely separated 'mansions' at one and the same time.² Four distinct 'mansions', viz. (1) that of Arphaxat and his followers ('Ekbatana'), (2) that of Nabuchodonosor and his people, (3) that of Holofernes and his army, (4) that of Judith ('Bethulia'), are separated from each other by neutral territories. Of pre-eminent importance for the entire theatrical design is the fact that this stage allows all the actors to remain visible to the spectator during the whole performance.

On the other hand, Eberle reconstructs Oehen's stage as a structure on two levels, a raised back-stage behind the acting-area on the ground-level.³ The background to the whole is formed by a plastic setting of a town, representing in the first act 'Ekbatana', in the second 'Bethulia'. In this two-sectional stage Eberle recognizes the survival of medieval tradition, and his observation is undoubtedly correct. On the other hand he over-estimates the significance of the back setting, which enables the players to retire from the spectators' view, and which he considers to be the beginning of a modern type of stage. This argument overlooks the

¹ O. Eberle, *Theatergeschichte der inneren Schweiz (Königsberger deutsche Forschungen, 5)*, Königsberg, 1929, p. 33.

² Cp. A. Nicoll, *Masks, Mimes and Miracles*, London, 1931, p. 194.

³ Eberle, *op. cit.* pp. 42-3; Plate 9, III.

fact that this kind of background, which was already known earlier than the seventeenth century,¹ is not the *neutral* limitation of the modern stage. The significance of making the visible section of the back-stage represent 'Ekbatana' or 'Bethulia' respectively is that during the play this also makes the invisible section behind the back-setting into a part of the town. Thus Oehen's stage still remains a stationary stage, the limitation of its stations to two and the partition of one of these into a visible and an invisible section being the only innovations as compared with the stage of the Fragment. Only its tendency to simplification hints at a change to the neutral single-scene of the modern stage.

A comparison of the two dramas is rendered more difficult by the fact that the Fragment follows the biblical narrative very closely.² In one single instance, however, the source is treated more independently. The Apocryphal book relates (I, 1): 'Arphaxad itaque rex Medorum, subjugaverat multas gentes imperio suo, et ipse ædificavit civitatem potentissimam, quam appellavit Ecbatanis.' There follows a description of the town (2-4), then the narrative continues: 'Anno igitur duodecimo regni sui, Nabuchodonosor, rex Assyriorum, qui regnabat in Ninive civitate magna, pugnavit contra Arphaxad, et obtinuit eum (6) In campo magno....'

This is the whole of the Arphaxat-story in the Book of Judith. The Fragment at first³ follows it closely, putting into the mouth of Arphaxat the description of his own strength and the mighty town of Ekbatana (II. 75-86). Thus the author succeeds in characterizing this king, who appears more arrogant and haughty than in the Apocryphal book. Nabuchodonosor learns of his boasting and sends an envoy to demand his submission, which Arphaxat refuses (II. 87-114). This sending of an envoy anticipates an incident which in the Bible follows *after* the Arphaxat-story. There it is written that Nabuchodonosor after his victory over Arphaxat sent ambassadors to all peoples (II) 'qui omnes uno animo contradixerunt, et remiserunt eos vacuos, et sine honore abiecerunt'. In the biblical narrative he calls together his officers and nobles after this refusal, to consult with them how to subdue the other nations (II, 2), but in the Fragment he first marches out and conquers Arphaxat (II. 115-38). After this he calls his nobles together for a council of war against the neighbouring peoples (II. 139 ff.).

¹ Cp. the review of Eberle's book by R. Stumpf in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, LVI, 494.

² Both the Fragment and Oehen's play are based upon the Vulgate.

³ The Synopsis (II. 17-24) does not differ from the Apocryphal book at all, and thus varies from the actual sequence of scenes.

The purpose of this transposition of the later scene of the negotiations with the neighbouring peoples into the Arphaxat-story is simply to expand the short outline of the biblical episode. In quite a different way Arphaxat's capture (l. 138), on the specific instructions of Nabuchodonosor (l. 127), is an addition of the author's, conforming to the conditions of his stage. Arphaxat's capture, under the conditions of the stage of the Fragment, means that he is led by Nabuchodonosor's warriors from his own mansion to that of Nabuchodonosor. And on a stage which does not permit of the removal of Arphaxat's 'corpse' from the spectators' view 'behind the stage', this is in fact the only possible method of treatment.

Between the Judith-drama of the Fragment and Oehen's voluminous *Tragoedia*, designed for performance in two days and with all its mythological accessories, there is as much difference as between a primitive woodcut and a pompous baroque ceiling-piece. Accordingly Oehen goes further in amplifying the Arphaxat-story. His first act includes a larger episode which in the Apocryphal book—and correspondingly in the Fragment—belongs to Nabuchodonosor's later military enterprises, namely the council of war, with the subsequent sending out of Holofernes. In Oehen's play it is the latter who subdues Arphaxat and brings the prisoner before his king. Thus the only addition made by the Fragment independently of the biblical source reappears here—Arphaxat's imprisonment by Nabuchodonosor's order. But whereas in the Fragment it was sufficient to transpose the ambassador-scene, Oehen has to repeat the incident of Holofernes' preparations for war. First he has to send him against Arphaxat (Act I, 1) and then again against Bethulia (Act II, 1). In view of the fact that Oehen is in command of an advanced dramatic technique, it would seem probable that there was a definite reason for so unskilful an expansion. Once more the conditions of the stage may offer an explanation for the form of the drama, and this assumption is confirmed by the whole structure of the first act.

It was a fundamental principle of the author of the Fragment to transform into action the biblical story in as complete a form and—with the one exception mentioned above—as unaltered a sequence as possible. Because the Apocryphal book opens with King Arphaxat, the first scene of the Fragment concerns him. Oehen on the other hand recognizes, rightly, that the Arphaxat-episode is nothing but a subordinate incident in the more important Nabuchodonosor-theme.¹ So his Nabuchodonosor

¹ Oehen's Arphaxat is no longer, as he is in the Fragment, just a repetition of the Nabuchodonosor-type; an attempt is made to characterize him as a counterpart to the latter.

is the hero, and the Arphaxat-scenes are amplified, to characterize this hero more clearly. Since he is the haughty challenger, Nabuchodonosor—in contrast to the Fragment—opens the play with a boasting speech. Then he calls a council of his nobles and sends Holofernes out against Arphaxat. Holofernes participates in this council; thus there is no need to call him in afterwards. This deviation from the source¹ is due to the same technical necessity which caused the repetition of the Holofernes-motive.

After the victory over Arphaxat in the Fragment, King Nabuchodonosor is shown in conversation with his three noblemen (ll. 139 ff.) and he then sends out a messenger to call Holofernes. In Oehen's *Tragoedia* also, Nabuchodonosor negotiates with three councillors; they are Amasa, Zoraster, and Holofernes, whom the king calls commander-in-chief ('Kriegsfürst'). Thus in the first instance this scene with the councillors corresponds to the scene of the war-council which occurs in a later position in the Fragment; but it then avoids the complicated summons by messenger. The significance of such a simplification becomes obvious if one tries to visualize the messenger's journey on the two different forms of stage. On the stage of the Fragment it is the way over neutral territory from the second station (Nabuchodonosor's) to the third station (Holofernes') and back. Oehen's stage has only two different sections, and during the first act the front-stage is Nabuchodonosor's place and the back-stage Arphaxat's. Thus on this stage there is no room left for Holofernes, as the invisible part of the back-stage during the first act also belongs to Arphaxat's town Ekbatana. So from the beginning of the play Holofernes has to be with Nabuchodonosor, and for this reason he has to take part in the action in the first act. Similarly, at the beginning of the second act, when the back-stage represents Bethulia, he cannot make his appearance from there but must already be on the front-stage (Nabuchodonosor's mansion).

These considerations lead to the following conclusions. The Fragment differs from the biblical narrative in some details which we find again in Oehen's *Tragoedia*. Later scenes are transferred to an earlier position, to make the scanty Arphaxat-action more suitable for stage performance. But at the same time there is a new meaning in this transposition as employed by Oehen: his stage is no longer the primitive stage with its numerous mansions, but represents a transition to the modern neutral stage which imposes new rules upon the structure of the drama. Thus

¹ (II, 2) 'Vocavit omnes maiores... et habuit cum eis mysterium consilii sui: (3) Dixitque cogitationem suam... (4) Quod dictum cum placuit et omnibus, vocabit Nabuchodonosor rex Holofernum....'

there is a relation between Oehen's play and the Fragment which is quite typical for a revision of an original drama in the terms of a more advanced stage. From the earlier play Oehen not only takes some details, such as the imprisonment of Arphaxat and the scene of the three councillors, but also the whole dramatic treatment, which he re-shapes for the purposes of his own stage.

Thus there is clearly a connexion between the two plays, and it offers an explanation for the decidedly medieval elements in Oehen's seventeenth-century drama. The Judith-play to which the Fragment belongs must have been known in Lucerne. And this conclusion hints at another hypothesis which must at once suggest itself when the stage of the Fragment is reconstructed. It is the resemblance of this reconstructed stage to the stage on which the 'Prodigal Son' of Hans Salat, town-clerk in Lucerne, was played in 1537.¹ In his diary Hans Salat records that he intended in 1534 to stage a Judith-play.² There is, however, one important objection to his authorship of the Fragment, namely the fact that his 'Prodigal Son' is of considerably higher dramatic quality than the Judith-fragment. But two explanations may be put forward to weaken this argument: (1) the Judith-fragment would seem to have been written several years before the 'Prodigal Son'; (2) there was no model for the earlier play, whereas the 'Prodigal Son' was strongly influenced by the *Parabel* of Burkart Waldis. Unfortunately a linguistic comparison between the Judith-fragment and Salat's drama is particularly difficult, since the only extant text of the 'Prodigal Son' was printed in Basel (by Lux Schaubert) and contains elements foreign to the speech of Lucerne.³ And the Fragment is in all probability part of a copy, so that the scribe's own dialect has also to be considered as a possible source of error. For these reasons we can only say that the Judith-fragment almost certainly forms the basis for Oehen's Judith-drama. A further interesting question is whether the manuscript here published for the

¹ Cp. Eberle, *op. cit.* pp. 41-2; Plate 9, I.

² '... do wot ich uf ostern historiam Judit spilen, aber sy erwertend mirs...' (J. Bächtold, *Hans Salat*, Basel, 1876, p. 45). Even if Salat does not say explicitly that he has written the play, the chances are in favour of his authorship. It should be mentioned in this connexion that there is also a formal resemblance, as Eberle points out, between Salat's 'Prodigal Son' and Oehen's *Sittenspiel von Hunger, Krieg und Tod*, of which a play-bill has been preserved. All the circumstances favour the assumption that Oehen had a knowledge of Salat's writings. Since he was in charge of the affairs of the citizens of Lucerne (cp. Th. Liebenau, *Der luzernische Bauernkrieg im J. 1653 in Jahrbuch für schweizerische Geschichte*, 1893, xviii, 282) he certainly had the opportunity of knowing not only the town-clerk's very important chronicles of the town but also the rest of his writings. And if he wished to defend the old dramatic tradition of his native Lucerne against the new tendencies of the Jesuit theatre, he must have deliberately continued what Salat had begun.

³ Cp. R. Brandstetter, *Die Mundart der alten Luzerner Dramatik*, in *Zeitschrift für hochdeutsche Mundarten* (Heidelberg, 1902), iii, 2.

first time is a part of Hans Salat's *Judith*—and thus of the earliest German Judith-play in existence.

VORRED

- Nun hörend zû vnd schwigend still
welches jr vernemen wil
So gar jn kurzer frist
was vor zeitten gschechen ist
5 wiewol ichs von mir selbs nit han
Sonder wier findens gschriben stan
Im büch Judith genant
das macht vnsz den handel bekant
Hierum so wollend nit verachtten
10 Sonder mit ernst vnd fûsz betrachten
nit die riemen vnd ander zier
alain wohin man vnsz mitt fier
dann weil ain Nusz ist schon vszwendig
so ist sy doch vil siesser jnwendig
15 also auch disz gegenwerttig geschicht,
alsz jr dann kurzlich werden bericht
Arphaxat ain künig der persier vnd meder
vnd viler künigkrich ain gewaltiger
Trost sich siner grossen hores macht
20 Hatt gottes Krafft nie gedacht
der selbig thett verfiengen
dz jnn nabochodonosor vsz assurien thett (bekriegen)
vnd gsigt jm ab zû ros z vnd fûsz
was dem arphaxatt ain hartte bûs
25 Nun diser nabochodonosor hett jm fiergenommen
den vmkraisz der welt zu überkumen
schicktt botten zu herren vnd stetten
ob sy jm vnderdenig sein wetten
dz selbig hand sy nit getan
30 sonder die botten on er haim glan
Ziehen / vnd dem künig sagen an
sy wollen jnn nit fier oberkait han
ob welchem der künig zû zorn ward bewegt
das er sienen walttigen den handel fierlegt
35 vnd thett mit jnen zû ratt gon
wie er sy woltt strafen lan
alsz nun jnen allen
sein mainung thett gefallen
Lies er berieffen Holofernum
40 sampt seinem kriegshör an ainer sum
diser Holofernes ward geschickt durch ale land
mit seiner werhafttigen hand
vnd mach sy dem künig all vnderdenig
die jm vor warend widerspenig
45 Zoch jn dz thal der statt bethulia
In welchem wonten die kinder Israhel
Nun hatt achior ain ammonittischer hoptman
ain red vor dem holofernes gethan
vnd hett bekant den ewigen gott
50 welchen verertt die israhelitisch rott

l. 17. The Apocryphal book has here 'rex Medorum'.

l. 22. The edge of the page is here cut too close; cp. also ll. 61, 202, 218.

- ob welcher red er vnd sein gantzes hor
 erzurnett würdend also seer
 dz sy jnn schickttend also gebunden
 an ainen bom damit jnn funden
 55 die burger vsz der statt
 welchen globen er vor holofernes bekennett hatt
 was sol ich wittersz sagen
 wie sich die sachen hand zûgetragen
 hatt sich ain witfrow herfier gethon
 60 fier jer mitbürger lib vnd leben lon
 hatt sich mitt holofernes der masz ver.
 vnd mitt jrer schon so doll gemachett
 dz er sein selbs gantz vnd gar vergasz
 vnd seins volcks schaden nit ermasz
 65 deshalb schlug sy jm ab sein hoptt
 vnd ward damit seins lebensz beroptt
 also thûtt gott der herr den allen
 die jnen selbs zû wol gefallen
 vnd in jerem hochmutt
 70 jm sine hand nicks gûts
 Mitt denen allen macht gott bald end
 der vns sein gnad geb vnd send
 Hirmit so schwige jederman
 vnd blaszend vff so wend wier dran
 Arphaxatt ain kunig in persien hob an /
 75 Phaxatt ain kunig in Persien vnd medien bin ich gnant
 durch die ganzen welt bekant
 Miner richtum krafft vnd der glichen
 leptt in kainen kunigsrichen
 So han ich mir ain statt egbatanis zûberaitt
 80 In welcher ich wone mit Meiner herlichaitt
 Die muren sind in der höße sibenzig elenbogen
 fier welche statt niemands ist gezogen
 der jer hab mögen gesigen ab
 an krafft meins zûgs ich ain grosse menge hab
 85 des trost ich mich vff diser erden
 Niemandes sol Mein gewaltig werden
 Nabochodonosor
 Wie tharstu sich der masz erheben
 vnd in solichem hochmûtt leben
 vnd dir ist weder wissen noch kund
 90 in welcher zit oder stund
 du von dinem rich wierst gestoszen
 Mit allen seinen bundsgenossen
 woluff jer Mein diener all schnell vnd behend
 wier wellen mit jm flux machen end
 95 darum wellen wier jm schnell absagen
 damit er sich vnser nit hab zubeklagen
 darum so farhin thû mir diesen brieff vollenden
 sprich nabochodonosor vsz asirien thû mich her senden
 doch beger ich von Euch frid vnd glaitt
 100 daby ist euch von Meins hern wegen abgesaitt
 Der bott (zum arphaxatt)*
 Gnediger herr eiuwer gehaisz so geschehen
 dz sond jer gwiszlich von mier sehen
 Der bott zum arphaxatt

- Nabochodonosor ain künig jn assiria genannt
 ich gedenk er sey euch wol bekant
 105 thütt mich hirhar zu euch senden
 seinen beuelch züuollenden
 bitt euch jer wollend sem genaigt
 den brieff zu lesen / euch ist daby abgsaitt
 Arphaxatt der kunig
 farhun sprich ich woll sein wartten
 110 mit spiessen buchsen hellebartten
 vnd mit meiner besten municion
 wol versechen jm engegen gan
 Der bott zum Nabochodonosor
 Er sprichth es sy jm nit laid
 mit euch zü stritten sy er beraidt
 Arphaxatt zü sinem volck
 115 Erschreckt nit lieben kriegsknechtt gütt
 Sind frolich vnd hand ain ringen mütt
 vnd lasz euch disz absagen nit bewegen
 wir wellend vnser find darnider legen
 vnd mit sig oberhand han
 120 wil selbs by euch vornen dran stan
 Der kunig nabochod zü sinem kriegsvolck /
 So wolhär lasz vnsz frisch vnd frolich sin
 Heitt so woll wir eer legen jn
 vnd mit vnserm vind ritterlich gsigen
 vnd jm zü veld obligen
 125 har har wier wollend frolich dran
 mit jm züschlachten heben an
 kundt jer so thünd den kunig fachen
 die andern soltt jer zedod schlachen
 Arphaxatt wiert jetz gefangen
 O wee das ich je ward geboren
 130 wie han ich mein richtum so schamlich verloren
 vnd alles was ich besessen han
 wie wiertt es mier so ellentlich gan
 Ain knechtt /
 Ey sich du müst sterben
 Vnd mit all dinem anhang verderben
 135 wem hastu egbarnis gebuwen
 vff welche du hatst dein vertruwen
 schwig still vnd gang redlich har
 du müst sein vnser gefangner
 Nabochodonosor zü sinen fürsten /
 Wo sind meine fursten alle sand
 140 kompt all fier mich här zehand
 vernempt was ich hab angeschlagen
 kurtz vergangen jn disen tagen
 wie ich mocht züwege bringen
 vff das mier nit thätt miszlingen
 145 an beschiermung meins küniglichen thron
 ob ich die gannz welt mocht viberkon
 mit gannzer macht vnd höres krafft
 das mine widerspenigen würden gstrafft
 disz alles han ich mier fiergenommen
 150 gedenkt ob mier dz mochte bekommen
 Der erst furst des künigs

- /. kunigkliehen
- Solt ich disem/. fiernemen wider sin
 wer ganz wider den willen mein
 Dann wo sich euwer kunigkrieh thett meren
 darin weltt ich höchsten flisz ankeren
 155 vnd daran spannen lib vnd gütt
 vngezwungen vsz freyem mütt
 Der ander furst des kunigs /
 Solch mainnung han ich oft betrachtt
 wie diser anschlag mehtt werden gemacht
 In ainer sum mecht werden bschlossen
 160 das man es thatt ganz vnuerdrossen
 vnd zugt durch die gantze weltt
 Lies sich nitt duren / lutt, gütt / noch geltt
 Der drit frierst des kunigs
 Damit wier aber disz k/. fiernemen mogen volenden
 wer mein ratt, nach einem dapfern man senden
 165 der sich des handels thatt vnderston
 vnd darby lib vnd leben lan
 vnd der kriegens wol bericht wer
 vnd dem grossen künig sonst nit vnmar
 Nabochodonosor zü jnen
 So last vnsz ain brüffen vö stünd vff dies
 170 der selbig holofernem berüffen mus
 das er vffs erst zu vnsz solle komen
 vnd jm offnen wer habend vnsz fürgenommen
 zükriegen alles land
 gehin den brieff gib jnn holoferno selbs jn dhand
 175 sag das er sich bald zu vnsz hafieg
 vnd sich wol rüst er mües jnn krieg
 Der bott zum holoferno
 Nabochodonosor ain künig vsz assiria genantt
 der hatt mich har zü euch gesantt
 das ich euch solle botschafft thün
 180 jer sollend von stund zü jm gon
 vnd jm sein fiernemen helffen volenden
 ich gedenck er wend euch weitter senden
 Holofernes zum botten
 farhin sprich ich woll mich nit sumen
 sonder vffs beldest zü jm komen
 185 vnd jm alsz Kö.' Mjt. zü willen werden
 ds sy wo es well vff diser erden
 vnd jn sinem dienst wagen lib vnd leben
 vnd alles dz ich hab vff diser erden
 Der bott zum künig nabochod /
 Diser man hatt zü mier gesprochen
 190 jn euwerm dienst sy er allzit vnuerdrossen
 zü dienen weil er lept vff erden
 vnd jn euwerm dienst ersterben
 Nabochodonosor zum holoferno
 Bis mier wilkum edler hoptman gütt
 farhin gerust mit frölichem mütt
 195 wider alle künigkreich so fein
 die mier nitt hand wollen vnderthenig sein
 vnd namlich wider alle die
 mier widerstrept hand je vnd je
 deren soltu kainem verschonen
 200 sonder aim jeden jn sonderhait lonen
 vnd sy alle mitt feür verbrennen

- vnd schlaipffen gleich ainem
 Holofernes vor dem künig
 Disz fiernemen wil ich volenden
 nach ainer grossen macht kriegsuolk senden
 205 mit welcher ich mich durch dwelt hinziehen
 damit jederman vor mier thv fliehen
 vnd wil euch machen die vnderthenig
 die euch sind gwesen widerspenig
 vnd jn euwrem dienst gehorsam sein
 210 die weil da wertht dz leben mein
 holofernes kertt sich zum kriegsuolk vnd sagtt
 Wolhar meine diener allesand
 wier wellend ziechen jn frambde land
 die selben ko.' M^{te}. vnderthenig machen
 dem folck jm land gelegken jer lachen
 215 vnd jnen machen offenbar
 dz kain gott vff erden ist dann Nabochodonosor
 holofernes zu ainem knechtt
 farhin thû das feld mit korn verbrennen
 wir wellend dz land schlaipffen glaich ainem
 ob wier mochten ain schrecken jn dz volck bringen
 220 vnd ob vnsz es thett gelingen
 ain knechtt jm huffen
 Was mich der hopttman hatt haissen thûn
 dz sol geschechen dann ich wil jm nachkom
 vnd solt es kosten dz leben mein
 so mûs dz korn verbrentt sin
 225 das korn hab ich verbrentt
 vnd dz land jemerlich geschent
 ich hoff vnsz werd gelingen
 wir wollen dz land on schwertschlag gwinen
 ich hab mich och ghaltten dz man wiert sagen
 230 hatt der tüffel dz folck ins land gtragen
 Bottschafft etlicher künigkrich
 Gnedigster Herr lasz ab von dinem grimen zorn
 eh vnd wier all werden vmbracht vnd verlorn
 dann besser ists lebendig des künigs diener sein
 wann sterben / verderben / vnd liden grosze Pein
 235 all vnser hab vnd gütt sey dein aigen
 wier wollen vnsz ghorsam vnderthan erzaigen
 wier ergeben dier all vnszer hab vnd gütt
 dem grossen künig vsz freyem mütt
 kum vnsz alain alsz ain fridsamer herr
 240 gedenk deins zorns gegen vnsz nit mer
 dann mier wollend dier alle
 vnd dem grossen kung zû füssen fallen
 von sein gnad vnd baren gerechtigkaytt
 allzit jn seinem dienst sein braytt
 Holofernes ganz wüttig
 245 Aus hinwegk ich gewer euch nit
 last nur ab von euwern bitt
 dann was ko. M^{te}. fier sich hatt genomen
 dem sol vnd mûs ich billich nachkomen
 hettens jer vorlengst getton

ll. 220, 224. After each of these lines a pause is indicated in the MS., intended no doubt for appropriate action.

- l. 260. '...stellen [solten?] zesamen'.
There is a break here in the Fragment. ll. 266-71 are presumably spoken by Holofernes.

- 300 Seittemalsz ich euch sol sagen
Hatt sich begeben vor ettlichen tagen
das die frag Holofernis an sein hoptlut ist gsait
was doch das fier ain volck soll sein
das jn disen bergen wone
305 vnd jm nit entgegen kome
vnd jnn nit erlich hab empfangen
mit sainem saitenspil jm entgegen gangen
do hab ich jms sagen ghan
des müs ich hir gebunden stan
310 ich sagtt alain jer hettet von gott gluck
diser red halb hatt er mich verschickt
Einer vsz der gmaind
Ach herr gott des Himelsz vnd der erden
wann wil disz hochmüts am end werden
wie verachten sy die hailgen dein
315 vnszer schutz vnd schierm du wollest sein
ach herr dich vnser erbarm
erzaig dinen gwaltigen arm
Zerschlach sy all die sich jerer sterke riemen
vnd jr horess macht nun hoch
Ain ander jud tröst den gfangnen
320 Der gott des krafft vnd macht du hast brisen
der woll die sach dahin laitten vnd wisen
das der wend offenbar
jener vmkumen gannz vnd gar
So vnsz dann gott von jnen erretten thütt
325 So soltu by vnsz wonen jn sicher hütt
du mit dinem ganzen huszratt
wo sy din herrz ain gfallen hatt
*
Holofernes zů sinem kriegsuolk
Sind gerust lieben kriegslutt gütt
sind frölich vnd hand ain gütten mütt
330 Jer missend hutt fier bethulien ziechen
gedenkt das jer nit thüendt fliechen
Ainer vsz der juden gmaind als er dise manung hort rufft er zů
O barmherziger gott und herr [gott vñ hilf
dein hilf vnd trost sy vnsz nit ver
jetz jn disen tagen
335 Herr erhor vnser jamer vnd klagen
Ain kriegs knechtt
Ain zisternen ich hie funden hab
last mich die selben graben ab
damit sy mangel an wasser habend
vnd vnsz die statt desz eh vfgebend
340 dann dieweil vnd diszer riche gatt
die statt gwusz kain mangel an wasser hatt
Holofernes erlopt jm das
Gang hin es sy dier erloptt
schaff das sy wassers werden beroppt
vnd nim zwen oder drey mit dier
345 daran thüstu ain gefallen mier

HELENE LEVINGER.

BENONI, S. AFRICA.

* There is a clearly indicated break here in the MS. (the end of an act!).

Note. I wish here to express my sincere thanks to Professor Edna Purdie for her kind advice and encouragement and for her revision of the English form of the introduction. H. L.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

SOME ELIZABETHAN TUNES

In the 'Notes upon the Tunes' in Professor Sisson's valuable *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*,¹ four tunes are given which seem to be unrecorded elsewhere. Perhaps the following references may help to identify two of these melodies.

'The Blazing Torch' (sometimes 'glazing torch') derives its name from the first line of the ballad 'A good wife or none', beginning 'The blazing Torch is soone burnt out' and directed to be sung 'To a pleasant new tune'.² Undoubtedly the ballad is that entered in the *Stationers' Register* for 14 December 1624 as 'Blasinge Torch both partes'.³ Furthermore, it seems likely that the ballad was in circulation before the date of entry and that the tune was sufficiently popular to be used by other balladists, for the ballad 'Keeping the widow wakeing' sung 'to the tune of the blazing torch' is reprinted by Professor Sisson (pp. 103-6) from the Bill of Information dated 26 November 1624. That 'A good wife or none' may have continued in popularity is shown by the five stanzas reprinted with many variations in *Wit and Drollery*, 1661 (pp. 24-5), as 'A Song' with the opening line 'The Blazing Star is soon burn'd out'. I have not located the music to the tune.

Several copies of a Christmas carol, 'The Angel Gabriel: his Salutation to the blessed Virgin *Mary*', sung to the tune are in the major ballad collections.⁴ In Richard Climsell's *Cupid's Solicitor of Love* [1638 ?] (sig. B₃) the tune is employed for a song beginning 'My love to me doth prove unkind'; in another miscellany, *Cupid's Garland set round about with Guilded Roses* [1675 ?], the tune is the setting for a ditty beginning 'When as the earth did blush with blood'.

'Angel Gabriel', another name for the air derived from the title of the Christmas carol, is the setting for Laurence Price's ballad on a naval engagement between Spain and Holland in 1639.⁵

¹ Cambridge University Press, 1936.

² The Rawlinson collection (198), Roxburghe, i, 140, and Pepys, iv, 49. A reprint may be found in *The Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. William Chappell, i (1871), 418-24.

³ See Hyder E. Rollins, *An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557-1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London* (Chapel Hill, 1924), no. 207.

⁴ For example, Euing, Glasgow, no. 126, Pepys, ii, 30, Rawlinson (176), reprinted in *The Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. J. W. Ebsworth, vii (1893), 779, and in *New Carolls for this merry time of Christmas*, 1661. For other ballads to the tune see Professor Hyder E. Rollins's *A Pepysian Garland* (Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 212, and the same editor's *The Pepys Ballads*, ii (1929), 111.

⁵ Reprinted from the Wood collection in Rollins, *A Pepysian Garland*, pp. 455-9.

Professor Sisson plausibly suggests that 'A. B. C.', a tune for the first song in the jig *Fool's Fortune*, is a variant of 'Rogerö'. It is also possible that 'A. B. C.' is simply another of the several names for the popular melody 'Fortune my foe', which is the setting for numerous ballads in rhymed eights, the measure of Jenny's song. 'A pleasant new Song of the backes complaint'... 'To the tune of A, B, C.', can be sung easily to 'Fortune my foe'.¹ The tune 'The Young Man's A, B, C.' is named on two ballads registered in 1634 and 1656.² The measure of the ballads, as Chappell points out, is again the same as 'Fortune my foe'.

Although writers of ballads and jigs made no consistent practice of employing tunes which fitted the mood of their productions, the author of *Fool's Fortune* might have been aware that 'Fortune my foe' would not only be an admirable setting for Jenny's opening song but would also be in keeping with the very title of the jig. In any case, though there is no actual evidence to prove that 'A. B. C.' is an alternative name for 'Fortune my foe', it is clear that the tunes were structurally similar.

'Barnaby', given in Professor Sisson's book as the tune for another part of the same jig, may possibly be the air cited with other ballad tunes in Additional MS. 28273, fol. 102 (ca. 1623-55), as a melody to be played on bells.³ I have found no other ballads sung to the tune. In *Wit and Drollery*, 1661 (pp. 22-4), there is a song beginning 'Alas poor silly Barnaby how men do thee molest' to the tune of 'Pip my Cock'.

ROY LAMSON, JR.

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS.

'MY SWITZERS'

At the beginning of *Hamlet*, Francisco, Bernardo and Marcellus stand watch before the palace. An Elizabethan would probably think of such guardsmen in terms of the Queen's yeomen of the guard, captained by Sir Walter Raleigh; and yet Shakespeare seems to show a difference. Potentates of the Renaissance, fearful of rebellion among their subjects, usually employed foreigners, especially Swiss, to protect their persons; and, later in the play when Laertes and his mob break into the palace, Claudius calls for his 'Switzers' to defend him. Marcellus and his companions would seem to be these 'Switzers'; and indeed their very names suggest southern Europe in contrast to the Danish Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. This explains their ignorance of Danish history, and their

¹ Reprinted in Rollins, *A Pepysian Garland*, pp. 166-9.

² See Rollins, *An Analytical Index*, nos. 3059, 2817, and *The Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. William Chappell, II (1874), 655, 651.

³ See the *Catalogue of Manuscript Music in the British Museum*, III (1909), 376.

appealing to Horatio¹ to explain the background of current politics. Their being foreigners, moreover, is evidently the reason why Hamlet does not turn to these soldiers, as he does to their prototypes in the *Bestrafte Brudermord*, to help him in his revenge; for, in the old play, they swear to him not only secrecy as they do in Shakespeare, but also positive, presumably military, aid. Had they not been foreigners, they would have constituted the Prince's most obvious allies: Marcellus is intimate enough with him to know, even better than Horatio, just where he is to be found 'most conveniently' on the morning after the first scene; and the body-guard of the King would be of invaluable service in a palace revolution. Unfortunately for Hamlet, however, they are not only sworn to defend the life of Claudius; but, being foreigners, they would care little about a Danish dynastic quarrel; and, indeed, their loyalty to Claudius is such that the mob 'o'erbears' them before it can break into the palace.²

The relative military status of these three has been matter for some disagreement, but can perhaps be settled. The tragedy opens with the changing of the guard at midnight, the appropriate hour for the appearance of the Ghost. The cold is piercing. Francisco is on watch; Bernardo comes; they exchange sign and countersign; and Bernardo takes his place. The watch is strict, for war seems imminent. In the 'Dramatis Personæ' first devised by Rowe in 1709 and generally followed since, Marcellus and Bernardo are designated 'Officers', and Francisco, a 'soldier'. The present writer can find only two possible reasons for making this distinction of status, and neither seems tenable. Although Bernardo usually calls Francisco 'you', he uses in one place 'thee'; and Rowe might have taken this as a sign of the latter's social inferiority; but this single use of 'thee' should rather denote a lapse into the intimate tone; for, if it expressed the gulf between private and commissioned officer, it would have been, not exceptional, but regular, as it is in the talk of Malcolm and Duncan to the bleeding Sergeant in *Macbeth*. The other possible basis for Rowe's opinion is Marcellus's reference to Francisco as 'honest soldier'; but 'soldier' in the general sense of a military man of any rank goes back in standard usage at least to the fourteenth century;³ Shakespeare so applies it to both Othello⁴ and Macbeth,⁵ who certainly were neither of them privates; and Prince Hamlet is several times, at least by implication, called a 'soldier'.⁶ If Shakespeare, more-

¹ See J. W. Draper, 'Hamlet's Schoolfellows', *E.S.*, LXIX, 350 *et seq.*

² *Hamlet*, IV, v, 98.

³ See *N.E.D.*, *s.v.* The quotation from Guy of Warwick refers to a knight.

⁴ See *Othello*, II, i, 36; and II, iii, 257.

⁵ See *Macbeth*, V, i, 41.

⁶ See *Hamlet*, III, i, 159; and V, ii, 407.

over, had intended the word to carry any such distinction as Rowe suggests, he would have used the regular Elizabethan term for a private soldier, i.e. 'centinel', one of a band or company of a hundred.¹ Not only are the scraps of evidence that might support Rowe of dubious cogency, but one positive argument seems definitely to refute him: at the very beginning of the play, Bernardo relieves Francisco upon the watch; and it is hardly reasonable that a commissioned officer would take the place of a private. Thus Rowe's distinction, followed by most modern editors,² seems to be unsupported.

Francisco disappears at line eighteen never to return throughout the play; and meanwhile Bernardo and Marcellus have brought Horatio to address the Ghost. Professor Jones takes Marcellus for 'a young recruit'³ because of his apparent ignorance of Danish history; but his being a recruit—if he were a Dane—would not explain his ignorance of the late King's glorious victories; and how could a mere recruit, lower even than a private, be so well acquainted with Francisco, Bernardo, Horatio, and even with the Prince himself? He is on an easy footing with his fellow-soldiers; with Horatio, he exchanges 'thee' and 'thou'; he is sure just where Hamlet is to be found early in the morning; and the Prince knows him well enough to trust his oath of silence about the Ghost. The three guardsmen seem to be clearly upon an equal plane.

Horatio and Hamlet so dominate the second apparition scene that Bernardo drops out, and Marcellus makes only the briefest comment; but it is he who first protests against Hamlet's following the Ghost; and he joins with Horatio in running after the Prince to see that no ill befalls. When they rejoin Hamlet, he is too good a soldier to ask questions, as Horatio does; he merely swears secrecy; and he keeps his oath; for, had he not done so, Claudius would soon have had the key to Hamlet's mystery. Indeed, both Bernardo and Marcellus appear as 'honest' soldiers—conscientious in their duties and loyal to the Prince, as long as that loyalty did not oppose the higher loyalty that they had sworn to the reigning King. They form a sort of introductory chorus to this drama of a 'warlike state', and fade out into the background as the main protagonists come in. In the *Bestrafte Brudermord*, Hamlet contemplates a military revolution, and so begins by winning the guardsmen to his side; but Shakespeare changes the technique of the conspiracy from force to

¹ See Digges, *Stratonicos*, London, 1579, sig. a iii.

² E.g., eds. Furness var., Hudson (revised), Rolfe, and Alden. Dover Wilson in the New Shakespeare lists all three as 'Gentlemen of the Guard'; but, more recently, he returns to Rowe (*What Happens in 'Hamlet'*, New York, 1935, pp. 66 and 206). Craig follows Rowe; but Brooke, Cunliffe and McCracken agree with the present writer in making no distinction.

³ H. M. Jones, *The King in Hamlet*, Austin, Texas, 1918 [1921], pp. 11-12.

diplomacy; and his variant treatment of the soldiers' parts, though neglected by critics, is significant of his subtler purpose. They are a group of foreign gentlemen serving Claudius, very much as Claudius in his youth had served 'against the French',¹ and, as foreigners sworn to support the political *status quo*, they not only cannot be the allies of the Prince against the King, but their presence makes a purely military revolution difficult if not impossible.

JOHN W. DRAPER.

MORGANTOWN, WEST VIRGINIA.

WORDSWORTH AND THE HORATIAN SPIRIT

Among the many aspects of the later Wordsworth which present themselves on a careful study of his work, one of the most neglected and one of the most interesting is the Horatian. It is a strange phenomenon, and one to which Sir A. Quiller-Couch has devoted a very suggestive essay, the fascination exercised and still being exercised over the English poetic mind by the great name of the 'Roman lyrist'. The most diverse and unexpected types have almost invariably managed to see in themselves the Horace of their day. Jonson, dramatizing contemporary literary feuds in *The Poetaster*, casts himself for the Horatian part: he is, of course, the blunt, honest man in a court world of hirelings and parasites. The classification of Donne's poems shows the same 'pitiful ambition' behind a tremendous and tempestuously different temperament. Milton perhaps succeeds, for reasons into which Sir A. Quiller-Couch goes with some detail,² in being more Horatian in certain of his sonnets than any other man—achieving there that union of urbanity and poetic vigour which is not so easy to attain as it seems. A feeling for conciseness in the poetical regurgitation of political fact, and something like the curt metrical speed of the writer who permanently embodies for us the ancient Roman spirit, together with the characteristic technical device of the 'dying fall', worked through Andrew Marvell to the one unforgettable moment of the *Ode upon Cromwell's return from Ireland*. But this excellent development was not pursued by later men. Rather it is Pope and Byron who are so perpetually posing as the ideal poet of the Sabine farm that, though their personalities were far removed from that of their original, they have managed to impress on the world their conception of the Horatian mood as the ultimate one: so that all subsequent 'imitations' felt impelled to drop into their tone.

¹ *Hamlet*, iv, vii, 84.

² *Studies in Literature*, i, 1920.

The true Horatian urbanity and grace are by no means accurately represented by the sharp-snapped wit and railing mockery of what one is, in this connection, compelled to call the Pope-Byron school. Still less is it by its entertaining but, from certain points of view, its degenerate offspring, the nineteenth-century *Vers de Société*, which, increasingly hampered both by its lack of moral earnestness and of real contemporaneity, has passed successively through the kaleidoscopic changes of Praed, Locker-Lampson and Dobson to its final mausoleum in the more recent pages of *Punch*. It finds better practitioners in the eighteenth century both in Cowper, as a composer of 'sermones' ('of all our English poets, the one who, but for a streak of madness, would have been our English Horace'¹), and, as a lyrist, in that too neglected poet, John Akenside. Here, in the existence in all three of the Horatian undercurrent, is perhaps to be found the secret of Wordsworth's undoubted interest in, and even enthusiasm for, the latter of these two writers.² In Akenside's works, particularly, one finds all sorts of what one may call modern and contemporary interests, woven into the neat and sober fabric of the true classical ode. It is these aspects of Horace that Wordsworth felt most keenly: and there are among his poems of the 1819-29 period several examples of his exploiting of this sympathy.

Nor is it too much to say that he was justified, even, in feeling that he could with all honesty regard himself as occupying personally in contemporary politics a somewhat similar position to that of Horace, from a consciousness of his ever more reasoned and reasonable attitude in upholding the dignity of the yeoman and peasant classes in the meretricious England of George IV. In the poem to *Liberty*, dated 1829, and published as a sequel to *Gold and Silver Fishes in a Vase*, a rather burlesque exercise with stylistic reminiscences of Gray, there occurs, amid references to Chaucer and Cowley, a most affectionate and feeling analysis of the Horatian temper: though one may reasonably suggest that the adoption of the Classical poet as a kind of *persona*, in the manner of Ezra Pound,

¹ *Studies in Literature*, I, 68.

² Not only is his copy of *The Pleasures of the Imagination* (a first edition, the excitement incidental upon the first arrival of which in the Wordsworth circle is perhaps reflected in Dorothy's letter of 2 September 1795, De S., No. 48) described as 'heavily annotated' in the Auctioneer's Catalogue, but he took from it a passage (Bk. IV, 102-4) as a motto for *Yarrow Revisited* (1835) and combined yet another quotation with a stanza of Thompson's to form part of the peculiar '*Cento*' whose publication reveals Akenside's still more intimate popularity in a sort of Japanese poetry game played in the family circle. Further, in a letter of 1837 (Knight, III, 150), he showed himself most solicitous to preserve and pass on to Dyce a minor oral tradition he had heard relative to Akenside's pleasure in the view at 'Goulder's Hill', Hampstead: and the sight of this view in the Spring of 1835 reminded him (E. Morley, *Corr. of Crabb-Robinson*, No. 152) of Bk. II, Ode XII, and 'stirred' his mind 'agreeably'.

has led to some exaggeration of his reluctance to accept Court preferment.

Give me the humblest note of those sad strains
 Drawn forth by pressure of his gilded chains,
 As a chance sunbeam from his memory fell
 Upon the Sabine farm he loved so well:
 Or when the prattle of Bandusia's spring
 Haunted his ear—he only listening—
 He proud to please, above all rivals, fit
 To win the palm of gaiety and wit:
 He, doubt not, with involuntary dread
 Shrinking from each new favour to be shed
 By the world's Ruler, on his honoured head.¹

His Maecenas is to be sought, not in that Lord Lonsdale whose patronage he demanded and accepted with his own peculiar brand of proud humility, for whose gratification he laboured over some years at a translation of Vergil's *Æneid* and to whom his attitude in some measure supplied justification for De Quincey's taunting allusion to a 'worldly tone of sentiment' in Wordsworth by which 'he was led to set a higher value upon a limited respect from a person high in the world's esteem than upon the most lavish spirit of devotion from an obscure quarter',² but in his more intimate friend, Sir George Beaumont. To him is addressed that *Epistle* in heroic couplets (1811) which opens the *Miscellaneous Poems*, in their present classification. Here we find the genial garrulity and love of characteristic human detail—the coast scene, the comic invocation of the Milk-Maid Muse, the humorous allusion to the magnified and exaggerated importance of obscure news items in that out-of-the-way locality, the trap, the children and all the novelties of country fare—a kind of Journey to Brindisi—just the lively stacking together of impressions of things seen and enjoyed, which is the essential quality of the author of the *Satires*: satire written when the 'word *Satura*, literally translated', meant 'hotch potch—and in letters became... a "miscellany"', a familiar discourse upon this, that and the other',³ written, in fact, before the word had come to connote the Juvenalian bitterness and causticity which it undoubtedly does in English.

The years 1819–20, the period of his correspondence with Lord Lonsdale before alluded to, mark the moment of his most serious studies of the Horatian Ode form. In four poems we find the same rather formal construction and balance of subject matter, the courtly artificiality of language slightly tinged with learned allusion, the maintenance of the elegant conversational tone and the undercurrent of domestic or personal

¹ *Liberty*, II. 100–10.

² *Literary Reminiscences*, ch. III.

³ Sir A. Quiller-Couch, *op. cit.*, I, 53.

emotion which gives genuineness to the work. One is the introduction to *The River Duddon*, addressed to his brother, the Rev. Dr Wordsworth, in which the minstrelsy of Christmastide leads to the praise of

Ancient Manners ! sure defence,
Where they survive, of wholesome laws.

The references to

the proud margin of the Thames,
And Lambeth's venerable towers,

and

the imperial City's dim

that

Beats frequent on thy satiate ear,

together with isolated lines from the Duddon sonnets themselves—a beautiful but much neglected series—all seem to echo the right note. Consider, for instance, the following:

Not envying Latian shades—if yet they throw
A grateful coolness round that crystal Spring,
Bandusia, prattling as when long ago
The Sabine Bard was moved her praise to sing;
Careless of flowers that in perennial blow
Round the moist marge of Persian fountains cling;¹

and

Dance, like a Bacchanal, from rock to rock,
Tossing her frantic thyrsus wide and high.²

Three remaining poems offer interesting points for study. During the *Tour on the Continent* of 1820, he wrote an *Ode on the Eclipse of the Sun*, in which beneath the stiffness of the phrasing, as is often the case with Akenside, the sudden change and its effects on nature are all clearly indicated with an almost scientific precision, while the description of the imagery on Milan Cathedral rises to a point at which it borders on the apocalyptic, the whole subsiding characteristically, but perhaps with needless banality—although in Wordsworth's own circle the passage was much admired³—to the concluding query as to what is happening the while at Windermere. *The Elegiac Stanzas* on the death of an American student whom he met on his travels (using here a rather strange but very effective stanza-form, a form which after a fleeting moment of precision in the central couplet reverts to the indefiniteness of the Petrarchan sestet) are more personal and show a clearer and simpler style. The lyrical, abstracted rightness of the closing words in the following lines is very striking:

We met, while festive mirth ran wild,
Where, from a deep lake's mighty urn,
Forth slips, like an enfranchised slave,
A sea green river proud to lave
With current swift and undefiled
The towers of old Lucerne !

¹ *Duddon*, No. i, ll. 1-6.

² *Duddon*, No. xx, ll. 13-14.

³ Knight, II, 200.

as is also the union of classical reminiscence and romantic suggestion in the lines:

Fetch, ye that post o'er Seas and lands,
Herb moistened by Virginian dew, etc.

And finally in a poem *Upon the Same Occasion* (that is, *September*, 1819) we have the autumnal scene hinting to the poet that his

leaf is sere
And yellow on the bough,

and that the 'myrtle wreaths' may their

fragrance shed
Around a younger brow.

Thereupon, there follows a discussion of the Poetic Spirit, where, in contrast to some who

their function have disclaimed,
Best pleased with what is aptliest framed
To enervate and defile,

(i.e. Lord Byron), come lines in praise of certain Classical writers. What better phrases could be found than those which fall so pat with each great name: Alcaeus, 'spirit-stirring', 'inflamed by sense of wrong'; 'the Lesbian maid, with finest touch of passion swayed'; the 'precious, tender-hearted scroll of pure Simonides' which he hopes may be found in the 'wreck of Herculean lore' whose exploration will be for his age

A genuine birth
Of poesy: a bursting forth
Of genius from the dust.
What Horace gloried to behold,
What Maro loved, shall we unfold?

he asks in conclusion.

Wordsworth is here far from being the Nature Poet of tradition. But this tradition is in itself little more than the survival in established criticism of the adolescent fixation of certain critics on the earlier developments of the poet. It tends, unjustly I think, to concentrate on the poetry of what Mr Garrod calls the *decas mirabilis*, poetry wonderful enough in its way, and even more wonderful when viewed in the right perspective, but unquestionably moving within very narrowly circumscribed emotional and intellectual limits. And this concentration is allowed to occur to the complete neglect of that extraordinary second synthesis which unites the many and surprising elements of vivid, new experience towards the 1837 period, and which is based on so much surer a human foundation than the preceding one. The poems just under discussion show something of the influences moving in this direction. They are not

major works. But to read them is to see Wordsworth from a totally new and instructive angle, and doubly so because it is an angle from which not infrequently, in his middle years, he saw himself.

BENJ. GILBERT BROOKS.

GREAT YARMOUTH.

‘LOS ENGAÑOS DE UN ENGAÑO Y CONFUSIÓN DE UN PAPEL’,
A PLAY BY DON RODRIGO HERRERA Y RIBERA

Los engaños de un engaño y confusión de un papel is, in an undated *suelta*¹ of Francisco de Leefdael, attributed to Agustín Moreto. Fernández-Guerra, after pointing out within the play (p. 529) the allusion to the revolt of Portugal in November of 1640,² concluded that it must have been written the following year. He also stated, ‘puede asegurarse que no es de las más claras y correctas de nuestro autor y que en algunos parajes, especialmente en los endecasílabos, se desconoce su pluma’. Schaeffer³ dismisses it contemptuously as one of Moreto’s *Dutzendware*. The present critic⁴ pointed out the fact that the second act closes in *silvas* rather than *romances*,⁵ but did not, for some reason, mention the lack of decorum which characterizes the acts of the heroines—both facts which argue strongly against Moreto’s authorship.

The plot, a highly improbable affair that is quite in the manner of the Calderonian drama of intrigue, has to do with two nobles, Don Diego and Don Juan, in love with the two daughters of Don Pedro. These are named respectively Doña Blanca and Doña Elvira. The author manages to keep all of the lovers unhappy through some 2600 lines. Such is possible (1) because Don Juan, through an honest mistake on the part of his servant, Pasamano, is led to confuse the names of the two sisters; (2) because Celia, the maid of the girls, drops the glove in which she is carrying Blanca’s secret message, and the two lovers, reaching for it at the same moment, tear both glove and note apart in the struggle that ensues; (3) the girls, meeting their *galanes* in the garden for a tryst, confuse the two in the darkness of the evening. Matters are resolved when the two pieces of Blanca’s note are brought together. It is discovered

¹ This *suelta* is not mentioned by E. Cotarelo in his *Bibliografía de Moreto* (Madrid, 1927), but I have seen it in a set of four volumes which are to be found in the Ticknor Collection. Leefdael died before 1730, and at his death his wife took over the business. (See Escudero y Perosso, *Tipografía hispalense*, p. 47.) This play was reprinted by her.

² *B.A.E.*, xxxix, pp. x and xxxii.

³ *Geschichte des spanischen Nationaldramas*, II, 171, Leipzig, 1890.

⁴ *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, pp. 144–5. Smith College Studies in Modern Language, October, 1931–July, 1932, Northampton.

⁵ Each act of Moreto’s plays closes in *romances*.

that her message had been so phrased that each half formed a complete whole, the first signed (apparently) by Elvira, the last by Blanca.

This play was written by Don Rodrigo de Herrera y Ribera. In his will of 14 December 1657—here it is stated that he is ‘caballerizo de la Excelentísima Duquesa de Nájera, Doña Inés María de Arellano’¹—one reads: ‘Declaro que a Juan Baptista Velarde, arrendador de los corrales de las comedias desta corte, le entregué una comedia mía intitulada *Lo cauteloso de un guante y confusión de un papel*, y por cuenta del valor della, que siempre se me ha pagado ochocientos reales por las demás que he hecho, tengo recibidos doscientos reales. Mando se cobren los seis-cientos restantes.’²

There is no doubt, I think, but what *Lo cauteloso de un guante y confusión de un papel* is the same play as *Los engaños de un engaño y confusión de un papel*. The importance of the glove in its plot, when taken in connexion with the identical phraseology of the last half of the title, proves it. If, moreover, we compare this play with *Del cielo viene el buen rey*,³ likewise attributed to Don Rodrigo Herrera, we find they are similar in style and versification. Both are written in stilted, courtly lines filled with elaborate and conventional metaphors, mythological allusions, long declamatory speeches, and gongoristic vocabulary (*cerúleo, clicie, mon-gibelo*, etc.). To judge by his metaphors, Herrera was fond of flowers. The versification of the two plays is similar, though *Del cielo viene el buen rey* is more varied because of the lyrical nature of its contents. *Los engaños de un engaño* has the following percentages: *romances*, 49·75; *redondillas*, 17·37; *décimas*, 18·12; *silvas*, 14·23; *sonetos*, 0·53. One finds this *tour de force* in Act I (p. 530):

Amor, mi locura
cura,
porque en tan querida
herida
gane mi atrevida
vida,

¹ See Pérez Pastor, *Bibliografía madrileña*, pp. 385–6, Madrid, 1907; here it is shown that La Barrera has confused the identity of the two dramatists of this name. Herrera was apparently a member of Luis Vélez’ circle in 1637 if we may judge by the following quotation, taken from the *Academia burlesca* of that year (see Morel-Fatio, *L’Espagne au XVI^e et XVII^e siècle*, p. 660): ‘Aquí entró Luis Vélez de mantenedor con una bocanada de poetas lacayos, que merecían ser sus mozos; y su Merced, guardando mucha correspondencia al Vélez, los buscó que acabasen en ez, como son Pedro Méndez, Don Antonio Martínez, Antonio Enriquez, y porque le faltaba uno, Don Rodrigo de Herrera se llamó Rodríguez’.

² There is mention also of an *entremés* ‘de unas burlas que se hicieron en el Prado a unos ciegos’ and of ‘unos papeles de versos sueltos y borradores de comedias escritas a diferentes asuntos’. The Prado is likewise the scene of action for part of *Los engaños de un engaño*; and the story of the two *graciosos*, Pasamano and Galón, forms an *entremés de burlas*.

³ Included in *B.A.E.*, XLV. First published in *Parte VIII* of the *Escogidas*, Andrés García de la Iglesia, Madrid, 1657.

si se aventura
ventura.
Cupido en blandura
dura,
será el desagrado
agrado,
huirá el desdichado
hado;
y será mi acierto
cierto . . . , etc.

Figures for *Del cielo viene el buen rey* are: *romances*, 55·16; *redondillas*, 27·03; *décimas*, 6·26; *silvas*, 4·71; *quintillas*, 4·06; *octavas*, 1·85; *liras* (abbacC), 0·93. The second act of this play ends in *redondillas*, and in Act III there are two *laisses* of *romances* (á, a-o) without intervening metre. There is in Act III a curious variation of the *décima* (p. 246), which is similar in its metrical acrobatics to the passage quoted above:

Tiene un amante en tener
amor crecido y robusto,
gusto;
faltando el desdén injusto,
se le acrecienta el querer
placer;
y el verse corresponder
va adquiriendo cada día
alegría;
dejad pues la cobardía
y amor juntos frecuentemos,
porque con esto tendremos
gusto, placer y alegría.

It would appear from the will of Herrera that *Los engaños de un engaño* was written shortly before his death in 1657 and not in 1641 as Fernández-Guerra had thought.

RUTH LEE KENNEDY.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

A NOTE ON GERHART HAUPTMANN'S 'HAMLET IN WITTENBERG'

Hauptmann's play *Hamlet in Wittenberg* appeared at the end of 1935. It is a strange coincidence that Karl Gutzkow should have published his drama bearing the same title in 1835, almost exactly a hundred years before. In the preface to his play Hauptmann declares roundly that 'a drama *Hamlet in Wittenberg* does not exist'. It is, however, clear from his Hamlet-novel *Im Wirbel der Berufung*, which was published in 1936, that he was aware, at any rate when writing the novel, of Gutzkow's work; only it seems to have slipped his mind when writing the preface to the play in October 1935.¹

¹ For a brief account of *Hamlet in Wittenberg* and *Im Wirbel der Berufung* see *German Life and Letters*, Jan. 1937, pp. 125-9.

Early in the novel Erasmus Gotter and some of the leading members of the theatre group at the court of the prince discuss over a morning glass of beer the proposal to perform Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, and in their discussion Gutzkow's play figures very prominently (*Im Wirbel der Berufung*, pp. 33 f.). One of the actors, Syrowatky, is eager to play the part of Hamlet, and the Direktor of the theatre group tells him jestingly that the title-rôle in *Hamlet in Wittenberg* would be more suitable for his youthful enthusiasm. Another actor says Syrowatky had better wait a while till Dr Gotter has finished writing his tragi-comedy *Hamlet in Wittenberg*, a statement which calls forth protests from the Direktor. '*Hamlet in Wittenberg!* Nonsense! Don't you remember what my colleague Serlo in *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* says about the adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* by Wilhelm-Meister-Goethe, in which the Wittenberg episode had been left out? Heaven be praised! says Serlo, that we are thus rid of Wittenberg and its University, which has always been a troublesome factor' (see *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*, Fünftes Buch, Viertes Kapitel. Cotta'sche Jubiläums-Ausgabe von Goethes Sämtlichen Werken, Band XVIII, S. 21). Erasmus Gotter (would it not be better to say Erasmus-Gotter-Hauptmann?) disagrees with this remark of the Direktor—'in spite of Wilhelm-Meister-Goethe'. Another of those present continues: 'Gutzkow once ventured to tackle this difficult theme, but he was not able to make enough of it.' 'I know his attempt', says Erasmus. 'But an attempt like that does not disturb me. The theme ought to be treated differently.'

The characters in Gutzkow's play are Hamlet, Horatio, Students, Faust, Mephistopheles, and Ophelia—a magic apparition. (Incidentally Gutzkow's play is interesting for the influence of Goethe's *Faust* which it reveals.) The conversation between Hamlet and his fellow-students at the beginning of the play gives a good impression of the wild life Hamlet is leading. The following outburst by Hamlet is typical: 'We are supposed to be here to study Roman law and Lutheran doctrines, so that we may one day rule Denmark's green island kingdom more like a philosopher than a king. And what is it we learn? Nothing more than the art how to eat one's fill, even if there is nothing but holes in one's pockets.' Faust is asked to call up spirits. 'Ask me to call up living persons' ('Fordert Lebendige'), is his retort, and amid smoke and fog Ophelia appears. Hamlet is quite convinced it is she. 'Her hips! Her blue eyes! Her curly hair, which flows down in blonde waves on to her breast! It is she, Horatio... Ophelia! O mirror of innocence, breathed upon by our impure breath, become not dim!' In the second scene Faust

tells Mephistopheles how he conjured up Ophelia before Hamlet. In the third scene Faust and Hamlet are together in Faust's inn. Hamlet begs Faust to let him see Ophelia again, and Faust grants his wish. Finally Hamlet falls into a trance, and Faust speaks over him the significant words: 'He will now go out into the world, torn, weak, only living in the shadow he throws... and his resolves will come to nothing, because of the means he chooses to carry them out. Like a wavering reed, wilt thou be blown hither and thither, O thou poor youth!' At the end of the play Horatio comes in and announces to Hamlet the death of his father, greeting him as the ruler of Denmark. The others cry out: 'Hail, King Hamlet!' 'I thank you', says Hamlet. 'And now for Denmark.'

There are certain obvious similarities between the two plays, as for example Hamlet's wild life at Wittenberg, and more particularly the way both plays end with the announcement of the death of Hamlet's father, which make it almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that Gutzkow's play had some influence on Hauptmann, at any rate in the early stages of his work on the subject, in spite of the fact that he had forgotten about it when he came to write the preface. This would indeed be typical for Hauptmann's technique. He gets an idea, works at it very seriously, hurriedly writes down a few scenes, makes sketches and drops it, returning to it again and again in this way, until in a final burst of concentration and real poetic enthusiasm the finished work appears. There are at least five distinct conceptions of *Hamlet in Wittenberg* in Hauptmann's library at Agnetendorf.

The reason why Hauptmann forgot Gutzkow's play when writing his preface is probably that his 'heroic' conception of Hamlet is quite opposed to that of Gutzkow. Gutzkow's conception, as expressed in the words 'torn, weak, only living in the shadow he throws', is in keeping with the interpretation given in *Wilhelm Meister*, and accepted for the most part ever since. In his Hamlet-novel Hauptmann gives expression at great length to quite different views, and although in the play Hamlet is moody and ever-changing, his character is by no means weak.

S. D. STIRK.

EXETER.

REVIEWS

The Secret Languages of Ireland. By R. A. STEWART MACALISTER.
Cambridge: University Press. 1936. 284 pp. 16s.

The chief part of this book is a study on the canting language of the Irish tinkers called 'Shelta', based on the papers of the late John Sampson which were handed over to Professor Macalister by the Gypsy Lore Society. Almost all the known material is given, most of it never printed before, with translations, phonetic transcript, and full etymological vocabulary. The author analyses the grammar of Shelta and shows that it is a late and artificial cryptic speech invented by bilingual speakers of English and Irish, English in construction and Irish in vocabulary; but Irish so mangled by deliberate inversions, metatheses, addition of prefixes and suffixes, etc., that hardly a word of it would be intelligible to the ordinary Irishman. This is a very valuable piece of work, and will be indispensable to all students of canting languages.

Professor Macalister's purpose is to show how throughout their history the Irish have been uncommonly fond of secret or rhetorical jargons. Others of these which he studies are *Béarla-gair na Saer*, 'straightforward modern Irish with a number of jargon words substituted for the orthodox words'; the curious vocabulary called *Dúil Laithne* from a seventeenth-century Irish manuscript, mostly factitious; the famous *Hisperica Famina*, a euphuistical early 'medieval Latin bombast of supposedly Irish origin; similar productions in contemporary Irish; and finally, Ogam. Most Celticists will disagree with Professor Macalister here.

The Ogam script was used for writing on wood and stone, analogous to the Runic alphabet; the inscriptions which survive belong mainly to the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., and the language in which they are written is called the Ogam language. It is a form of primitive Irish in much the same stage of development as the cognate British and Gaulish under the Roman Empire. Since the earliest manuscript Irish, a century or so later, is very much more broken down, Professor Macalister believes that Ogam is a very ancient artificial survival. Hence an elaborate theory built up to explain it—that the script was derived from a sixth century B.C. Italic Greek alphabet, turned into a sign-language (since there is no evidence for a *written* language in Gaul so early), used for speaking Goedelic, i.e. primitive Irish, in Gaul, and re-adapted to writing centuries later when, in some way unexplained, it had come to Ireland; and that this Ogam sign-language was used by the Gaulish Druids for their hypothetical sacred hymns, and so kept alive like Vedic Sanskrit for hundreds of years, till it appeared in writing in sepulchral inscriptions of fifth-century Ireland. That such a secret sign-language ever existed; that the Gaulish Druids ever had an archaic, still less a cryptic, speech; that the Irish Druids can be safely compared with the Gaulish—are a few of the unwarrantable and ill-proven hypotheses built up by Professor Macalister into an edifice of speculation and inference in which his native

ingenuity has outrun his judgement. The whole theory is in fact quite unnecessary. Ogam is no more archaic than British was at the same time, and the earliest manuscript Irish is far less broken down than Old Welsh, the contemporary descendant of British.

KENNETH JACKSON.

CAMBRIDGE.

Old English Elegies. By CHARLES W. KENNEDY. Princeton: University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. x+104 pp. 9s.

In this book Professor Kennedy, who is well known for his prose renderings of *Cædmon* and *Cynewulf*, now publishes translations in verse of the elegies, among which he includes the 'solitary survivor' passage from *Beowulf*.

Although the book is designed, primarily, for the general reader, the student will find, more especially in the Introduction, much that is helpful. Here a brief general survey is followed by a somewhat detailed review of the more important critical studies of the individual poems. This is admirably clear and concise, and, in some cases, can have been no easy task. Selecting from the mass of material bearing, for instance, on *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer*, or on *Deor*, and reducing it to a reasonable compass is a formidable business. It follows from the nature of the Introduction that it contains little original matter, but one interesting theory may be mentioned. Professor Kennedy suggests that the epithet *geomor*, used of the cuckoo's song in *The Seafarer* and *The Husband's Message*, describes the phenomenon, 'in June, he changes his tune'. It thus gives an indication of date—that the voyage is to be undertaken later in the year, in high summer, when calm seas may be expected. But, from classical times at least, the cuckoo has played a double part. It is the harbinger of spring; it is also a bird of ill-omen. *Geomor* probably refers to the latter role.

It is unlikely that there will ever be general agreement about the Christian element in the elegies. Is it, or is it not, integral to the poems? Professor Kennedy believes it is, maintaining, for example, that the whole of the 124 lines of *The Seafarer* is the work of one author. Yet to many it will seem that Professor Kennedy's own work betrays him. For not all his skill as a translator can make the Christian passages of *The Seafarer* anything but dull and flat in comparison with the passionate vigour of the heathen section. Among minor points to be noted in the Introduction is the absence of any reference to Leo, who identified the site of *The Ruin* with Bath in 1865, thus antedating Earle by some years.

An unrhymed alliterative measure of four beats is selected for the translation in the endeavour 'to produce modern verse faithful to the text, and suggesting, as changes in linguistic forms may permit, the rhythm and alliterative beat of the original'. Though the translation is often free, Professor Kennedy generally reproduces the form and spirit of the poems well, and renderings such as those of *Deor* and the first section of *The Seafarer* justify his method. But he is not uniformly so

successful. In the great *ubi sunt* passage of *The Wanderer* he fails to convey the poignancy of the original, while the last line of *The Ruin* is hardly worthy of that noble fragment. In spite of some considerable achievements in this volume, it still remains doubtful whether a translator is well advised in selecting a verse form for his modern renderings of Old English poetry.

Technically, the book is most attractive. It is well printed and produced; there is a good reproduction of a folio of the *Exeter Book* (*The Wanderer*, ll. 1-33) for a frontispiece, and the proofs have been read with care.

E. BLACKMAN.

LONDON.

Sense and Thought: a Study in Mysticism. By GRETA HORT. London: George Allen and Unwin. 1936. 262 pp. 8s. 6d.

The Cloud of Unknowing, one of the most interesting of medieval guides to the contemplative life, was written by an unidentified Englishman in the fourteenth century. In the seventeenth century, Augustine Baker took it as the text for an exposition of his own mystical teaching. Now Miss Greta Hort has used it again, as a springboard from which she plunges into what is not only, as it seems on first appearance, a systematic critical commentary, but also a vigorous and original discussion of some of the central issues of practical mysticism.

Drawing upon the same author's more advanced discourse, *The Epistle of Privy Counsel*, Miss Hort has examined the implications of *The Cloud of Unknowing* in the light of certain recent philosophical and psychological studies. Her analysis of such conceptions as that awareness of ignorance and of desire to know that the author found lying like a cloud between his God and himself, 'the naked intent of the will', that concentrates and focuses the manifold strivings of the whole personality, the union with God in which love finds 'its need for creation satisfied to the full', is always searching and resourceful, and her conclusions constantly illuminating for the student of literature as well as mysticism.

Any criticism of such an interpretation must, of course, be affected by considerations on which there exists a wide difference of opinion. In the judgement of the present reviewer, for instance, Miss Hort has not always taken sufficient pains to avoid the pantheistic complications of the pseudo-Dionysian God, pains which the medieval author took. And she might well have leaned a little more heavily to the side of his caution about the possibilities of human stability in this world.

Sometimes Miss Hort's exegesis seems more complicated than the original, but on the whole this subtlety is more than atoned for by the richness of the development of the main themes and the scope of the supplementary analyses. Her studies of the psychology of penitence, of the bounds of self-consciousness, of the impersonal elements in the love of God, of the relations between the active and the contemplative life of the mystic, are excellent both from the critical and the practical point of view. Finally, her discussion of the effect of the largely kinaesthetic

form in which the medieval author's experience took shape in his mind upon his description and interpretation of ecstasy, for instance, is thoroughly fresh and illuminating.

HELEN C. WHITE.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

The Comedy of Acolastus, translated from the Latin of Fullonius by John Palsgrave, edited, with an introduction and notes by P. L. CARVER.¹ London: Oxford University Press, for the Early English Text Society. 1937. civ+312 pp. 20s.

This is in several respects an excellent piece of work. The text itself, so far as I have tested it, is free from errors more serious than the omission of a final *e*. In his lengthy introduction Dr Carver appears to have collected whatever information about the translator can be found, and has woven it pleasantly enough into narrative form. If the story remains at some points conjectural, he is quite frank about it, and after all a biographer may claim some latitude of conjecture. As regards the translation itself, Dr Carver has dealt very fully both with antecedents and consequents, in particular its relation to the theory and practice of Latin teaching in the sixteenth century, a subject to which he has devoted much attention and considerable space. Indeed, the space might perhaps be thought excessive, considering what other matters he has passed over in silence. We should, for instance, have expected some account, however brief, of Fullonius and the position occupied in humanistic literature by the original work. Certainly we had a right to expect some account of the printing of the translation and the form in which it has come down to us. In the index the only reference under Berthelet is to his printing *A Glass of Truth*; so far as I can discover there is nowhere any mention of the fact that *Acolastus* also came from his press, for in reprinting the original edition Dr Carver has omitted the colophon: 'Impress. Lond. in ædibus Tho. Berthel. regii impressoris, Cum priuilegio ad imprimendum solum.' The underline to a collotype of the title-page supplies the only information that the reprint has been based on the copy in the British Museum, though this appears to be so from internal evidence: Dr Carver does not mention whether he consulted any other, nor indeed what copies are extant.

The notes again are very full, filling over a hundred pages of small type, more than half the number occupied by the text: they are clearly the outcome of much labour and research, and full of valuable information. I fail, however, to see the point of such annotations as the last: '**contentation**. Contentment, satisfaction. See the *O.E.D.*' No reader is likely to be in doubt over the meaning, and if he is the obvious recourse is to the dictionary: anyway, what is a glossary for? It is only natural that, on the other hand, one should now and again miss the information one seeks. In the course of the introduction Dr Carver quotes the

¹ The title-page is rather ambiguous, suggesting that Dr Carver has contributed an introduction and notes to a text prepared by someone else. I understand, however, that this is not the case, and that he is throughout responsible.

sentence: 'you shall beare me oone whystersniuet, or gerte...', but his delicacy in omitting the words 'on the bare buttoke' obscures the antithesis; for, as he explains in the notes 'whystersniuet' means a box on the ear (the glossary only giving 'a sharp blow'). The glossary (but not the notes) renders 'gerte' also by 'a sharp blow', which, no doubt, is correct, but does not explain the word. I presume that it is an erratic spelling of 'gird', stroke, though the *O.E.D.* does not record the form. But, most curious of all, I have found no explanation whatever of the peculiar symbol '.i.', which occurs in almost every other line of the English text. Readers versed in Latin abbreviations will, of course, at once recognize it as the common suspension for *id est*, but it is surely unusual in English.

The volume ends with a general index, a glossary, and an 'Index of proverbs and familiar sayings'. This is very welcome: but I wonder why 'Naked as my nail' appears under 'Nail', while 'Belly naked' appears under 'Naked', though there is also a heading 'Belly'. 'Rule the roost', by the way, is a vulgar error: it should be 'Rule the roast': Palsgrave's spelling 'roste' is no doubt meant for the latter.

I have said that the text is substantially correct. But from a technical point of view it is a curious mixture of meticulous conservatism and arbitrary alteration, and the editor has nowhere condescended to explain his procedure. In the original each scene is given first in Latin and then in English: in the reprint the Latin is given on the upper, the English on the lower, part of the page; a much more convenient arrangement, but one which (since no warning of the change is given) leaves the reader wondering why phrases from the Latin are often repeated in the margin of the English. Headings are displayed much in the manner of the original, but since they do not follow it line for line, upper and lower case are sometimes interchanged, and this has led to errors. Thus on p. 3 'REDOVB|*ted*' has been misprinted 'REDOUBTED', and (perhaps worse) '*souerayne*' has become 'SOUE-|*rayne*'. Moreover, black-letter **U** has throughout been erroneously rendered by U instead of V. One hoped that by this time editors had learned the correct use of these letters! Italic is used to represent italic, but roman has to do duty both for roman and black letter. There are some curious confusions. Thus on p. 13 the text begins extraordinarily: 'PELARGUS Ciconia'! In the original it is: 'Pelargus Ciconia'; but the upper-case E and C are really the upright capitals of the italic fount, and elsewhere in the reprint they have been rendered by italic (the roman 'i' in the reprint is a mere blunder). One gets the impression that the edition set out to be as nearly as possible a facsimile, and was then upset by the interference of someone with a very limited knowledge of typography. A curious thing has happened to the Latin on p. 23, which contains six accents and a comma not in the original. Some reader added them with a pen in the Museum copy, and they have been innocently incorporated in the reprint.

Dr Carver has aimed at furnishing an exact reprint, without attempting to emend either the Latin or the English. If, as he confesses in his preface, he was at one time tempted to alter the phrase 'to to mystrustful',

we may indeed be thankful that he decided to leave things alone. At the same time I cannot think that the reproduction of errors without notice fulfils the duties of an editor. He should at least somehow record obvious misprints, and not leave readers guessing whether they are his own errors or those of the original. Nor, of course, has Dr Carver been consistent: 'a lytt ell' is silently corrected to 'a lyttell' (p. 3), but '*i ter maximus*' is left alone (p. 87). On p. 146 'anxesis' appears in the text without comment; it is only when the passage is quoted in the introduction that the word is explained as an error for 'auxesis'. In the Latin on p. 87 we read: 'Hoc te dijs parem. | Facit', which is shown to be wrong not only by the translation but by the marginal *Phrasis*: 'Hoc te dijs parem facit'. These instances result from checking a few sample passages. Conservatism in an editor is no doubt a virtue, but it may easily become a mere cloak for laziness.

But the most serious fault I have to find with Dr Carver's work concerns his rendering of documents cited in the introduction. One thing, and it is not a small one, may be said to his credit: he has gone to the original State Papers and not contented himself with the versions and summaries in the *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII* (which he cites without explanation as *L.P.*). Good intentions, however, are not enough. In the first place it would have been wise to distinguish between original letters, drafts, and copies. I know that historians have set a very bad example in this respect; but it is often important to know whether or not a document is in the author's own writing; while a draft may have been afterwards altered or even abandoned. At one point Dr Carver has an interesting note (p. xiv): 'The letter is in a hand strongly resembling Palsgrave's, and the probability is that Palsgrave wrote it himself and passed it to the Queen [Mary of France] for signature.' There can be no doubt, I think, that the hand is Palsgrave's, writing, as would be natural, rather more carefully than usual, though the inaccuracy of the reprint obscures some of Palsgrave's characteristic spellings.

Unfortunately this inaccuracy persists throughout: no real attempt has been made to render the documents correctly, though by retaining the eccentricities of spelling and graphic peculiarities of the originals, a specious air of accuracy has been imparted to the transcripts. In point of fact there is hardly a quotation that does not bristle with errors of spelling, and there are at least two misreadings of a serious nature: 'in the roman tyme' for 'in the vacacōn tyme' (p. l) and 'hys present conseyllour' for 'hys princes consayllour' (p. li). A number of small words are either omitted or inserted, and twice I have detected the omission of nearly a line (p. xiv, l. 6, after 'home.' and p. xxxi, l. 18, after 'howndes,'). The treatment of capitals, of *u* and *v*, and of punctuation is arbitrary and inconsistent. It may be presumed that Dr Carver has been let down by an incompetent transcriber, though this is, of course, no excuse; but there are a number of absurdities which, even without reference to the originals, should have given pause to an editor whose mind was on his job, and which I find it difficult to believe were passed without query by the Oxford Press readers. For not only is there no

consistency in the retention or expansion of contractions, but on several occasions the misrepresentation or total omission of such marks has produced manifestly impossible forms (p. xlviii, l. 7, 'pfouyndely' for 'pfouyndely'; l. 10, 'pfremēt' for 'pfremēt'; p. lvi, l. 23, 'pvrbs' for 'pu'bs' = proverbs; &c.).

More specific notes on some of the documents may be advisable.

P. xxvi; S.P. 1, vol. 55, fol. 14 This is an unsigned draft with alterations. Some of the words printed are deleted in the original, and some interlineations are omitted. It is true, however, that the intention in the original is not very clear.

Pp. xxxvi-xxxviii. The three documents of 'The Attack on Wolsey' raise curious problems which Dr Carver's speculations do not wholly solve. The first is a careful copy, signed by Palsgrave though not in his hand. In the heading, by the way, 'conducted' should be 'conduyted', the interesting early form from French *conduire* before it became Latinized, as it did as early as the fifteenth century. The second and longer document is autograph and signed. The third is also in Palsgrave's hand, but unsigned. Dr Carver quotes the opening sentences from the *Letters and Papers*, adding: 'The original, in the Record Office, is so faded and damp-stained as to be indecipherable to ordinary eyesight.' It depends, of course, what you mean by ordinary eyesight. The original (S.P. 1, vol. 54, fol. 251) is written in rather pale ink and the first page is rather dirty (I see no evidence of damp), but most of it can be read without much trouble. In l. 4 of the extract given, 'for much' should be 'for so much', and in ll. 9-10 'it hath pleased' should be 'it pleased': the first error is Dr Carver's, the second he took over from his source.

P. xlvii; S.P. 1, vol. 71, fol. 174; l. 2. 'to lyue off an vnyuersite' is nonsense; the original has 'lyue out off'. Ll. 3-4: 'I...trust...ones [soon?] to be Doctor': 'ones', of course, is 'once', sometime. Two quite pointless omissions are indicated, and suggest that Dr Carver had difficulty in reading the original: ll. 6-9 should run (I add the omitted words in brackets): 'my paynes whyche nowe be intollerable more for the cōtinuall attendance [whyche dare neuer be from the chylder] than for my labowrs [to teche thē] which intollerable attendance ys greatly hurtfull to my helth.' L. 12: 'w^t in xvj myles' is no doubt what Palsgrave meant to write, but he left out the 'in': l. 13: no doubt he might have written 'haue prouisions', but he did write 'haue my prouisions'. L. 16: he did not spell 'fare very well' as 'fayre'.

P. xlviii, l. 24. The extraordinary spelling 'lije' is correct, but 'conuersid it vnto Inglisch' is not English at all: the original has 'in to'.

P. li; S.P. 1, vol. 83, fol. 165; l. 2. 'ye' should be 'y^s' (i.e. this), and 'pryer he' should be 'p^ror y^r he' (i.e. prior there, he).

P. lvi; S.P. 1, vol. 195, fol. 213; ll. 1-2. 'conquered and great nūb[er] of the captayns' is the sort of nonsense that should have aroused an editor's suspicion. In the original the last two letters of 'and' are deleted. L. 18: the spelling 'fath^r' conceals the remarkable occurrence of a perfectly formed *p* (not a *y*) in 1544.

Quotations from printed books are hardly more satisfactory. Dr Carver

does not divulge the source of the quotation from *The Lady of May* on p. lxxv, but it looks as though it were meant to reproduce the first edition (in the *Arcadia* of 1598). It is, however, full of small errors such as 'quodammodo' for 'quodammodo' and 'in ceteris' for 'in cæteris'; and when he corrected 'emnitie' he might have corrected 'verbus'! Quoting *The Four Elements* on p. lxxxii he has replaced *q* by *s*, thus crediting Rastell with such unlikely spellings as 'boks' and 'wyttts'.

On p. xii (foot) 'Abbéville' should have no accent; p. xiii, note 4, 'Bibliographical' should be 'Philological' Society; p. lvii, l. 24, 'conjugations' should presumably be 'conjunctions'. The *Life of St George* mentioned on p. xx is Barclay's translation from Battista Spagnuoli (Mantuanus): a copy is at Trinity College, Cambridge (Sinker 22).

No one can doubt the amount of labour and enthusiasm that has gone to the production of this work, for which students of education will be particularly grateful; but at the same time it seems to me that Dr Carver has shirked many of the duties of an editor.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

The Arte of English Poesie by George Puttenham. Edited by G. D. WILLCOCK and A. WALKER. Cambridge University Press. 1936. cx+359 pp. 21s.

Although the late G. Gregory Smith included *The Arte of English Poesie* in his *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, with valuable annotations, a separate edition of the work and a full consideration of all the problems involved in it have long been needed. Professor Gregory Smith himself became convinced while his book was in the press that the traditional ascription to 'George' (Puttenham) must be abandoned, and that a better heading would have been 'Richard Puttenham', or simply 'Puttenham'. More recently an attempt was made to ascribe the book to Lord Lumley (cf. *R.E.S.* 1925, pp. 284-308). Such differences of opinion made an exhaustive inquiry into authorship extremely desirable; this the editors supply; and it will be difficult to contravene their conclusions except on minor points.

They support their claim for the Puttenhams with reference to papers in the Record Office which show 'that there is no valid evidence against authorship by either George or Richard and a great deal which narrows the case very definitely in favour of George'. And George it is, for the following good reasons: there is no evidence that Richard had any literary interests, whereas a careful examination shows that George had many things in common with the author of *The Arte*. He was born about 1529; he, like the author, probably travelled abroad at a time when few Englishmen were affected by foreign influences; he was a Cambridge man, and an ambiguous sentence in *The Arte* does not necessarily mean that the author was an Oxford man (it is merely a matter of inserting a comma in the right place); he had a legal training, which agrees with the legal flavour of anecdotes in the book (though I am not sure that Harington meant more than 'any subtle student of

poetic laws' by his words 'anie subtle lawyer' in the Preface to *Orlando Furioso*). Moreover, George Puttenham had literary interests, writing a *Justification of Queen Elizabeth*; he moved among courtiers, being related to some, and might well know Dyer and the Earl of Oxford; he was the brother-in-law of Sir John Throckmorton who was a friend of the author of *The Arte*. All this biographical evidence is supported by a comparison of *The Arte* and *Partheniades* (loyal poems written by its author) with George's *Justification*, which have in common 'a realist and tolerant outlook on the world as it is', a hatred of Puritanism, a remarkable 'copiousness' and progressiveness of language and some unusual words, a similarity of style which suggests 'the same mental habits, the same personality, and the same convictions'. Though not conclusive, the argument is the most convincing which has yet appeared on the subject.

Readers of *The Arte* have often noticed loose ends, repetitions and omissions, have remarked on the presence in some copies of the 1589 edition of what Arber called 'cancelled leaves', and have usually concluded that the book was written about 1585 and partially revised before publication. Miss Willcock and Miss Walker, however, believe that *The Arte* 'grew with its author's growth, and that its apparent inconsistencies and indubitable reconsiderations are pointers to the processes by which an interesting mind arrived at its conclusions, as well as to vicissitudes and cross-currents in the Elizabethan world at large'.

The grounds for this interesting theory are, briefly, that 'large portions... are difficult to blend with the spirit and activities of the "busier pageant" of the eighties', that the author's text-book is *Tottels Miscellany*, that drama to him means the moralities and interludes, that his references to the poetry of the eighties are islands 'stretching over the latter part of Book II and the whole of Book III', and that his own prose has no tinge of Euphuism. Into the ramifications of the most ingenious discussion tending to show that *The Arte* was begun as early as 1569, I cannot enter here. It certainly is one way of explaining the facts; yet is it the only way? The following passage should have been considerably expanded:

The hypothesis of an old man setting about the composition of a book in 1585 and, through failure to adapt himself to the new age, overweighting his work in the direction of the studies of his youth, is inadequate to explain the facts. There is no sign in the *Arte* of any hardening of the mental arteries. It is, moreover, a carefully planned book; had its scheme first been thought out about 1585 the emphasis and proportions must have been different (p. xlvii).

This may be all right, but needs further consideration. What if the book were begun in 1580, or between 1580 and 1585? George Puttenham would be in his early fifties. Need we assume that his mental arteries were hardening because in the first two books of a formal treatise he relied on printed sources and authors already universally popular? Are we justified in assuming that when Ben Jonson (according to Drummond) said that *The Arte* was 'done 20 yeers since & Kept Long in wrytte as a secret', he meant 'written 20 years before publication'?

In the last part of their Introduction the editors have some illuminating

remarks on Puttenham as a critic, his views on prosody, his relation to the 'Rhetoric' books, and his connoisseurship of words. This is a most valuable addition to what has been written elsewhere about the place of *The Arte* in critical history. It is pleasing to find such emphasis laid on the individual nature of Puttenham's enjoyment of literature. Under the hands of these editors the book comes to life. Could one commend a scholarly edition of a technical treatise in warmer terms than that?

GEOFFREY BULLOUGH.

SHEFFIELD.

Florio's *First Fruits*. Edited by ARUNDELL DEL RE. (*Memoirs of the Faculty of Literature and Politics*, Taihoku University, Vol. III, No. 1.) Formosa. 1936. 2 vols. Text, 163 pp. Introduction and Notes, lxiv + 149 pp.

Vol. I of this publication offers a facsimile reprint of the rare first edition (1578) of the first set of Florio's Italian-English dialogues. In Vol. II, the Introduction reviews the salient features of Florio's career, elucidates the background of the *First Fruits* and discusses, with full supporting illustration, certain topics of special interest, particularly Florio's application of proverb-lore and his language and style; the Notes contain more detailed linguistic comment, Italian and English, and information and parallels amplifying Florio's local colour. Professor del Re is to be congratulated on his decision to issue a facsimile text. It has preserved Vol. I from the Japanese compositors who make hay merrily with style and meaning in Vol. II, and these facsimiles provide invaluable first-hand material for the discussion of Elizabethan problems, textual, bibliographical and linguistic—material the lack of which is felt everywhere but especially in all remoter seats of learning.

Florio has been much in the limelight lately, but Professor del Re's interest in him is long-standing. Before his translation to Japan in 1926 cut him off from such sources, he had been discovering in the State Papers evidence of Florio's non-literary activities of which the story has since been told in Miss Yates's biography. His most valuable work in carrying forward the study of Florio seems to me to lie in the emphasis he is qualified to lay on certain elements in the Italian Renaissance background and, still more, in his vigorous discussion of Florio's linguistic equipment and stylistic affinities. Though this also represents a long-established interest, it chimes happily and effectively with certain strengthening tendencies in our contemporary approach to Elizabethan letters.

The book itself, *First Fruits*, is a meagre affair and might appear to offer little more than a series of pegs on which to hang notes on Elizabethan life and customs. The editor extracts the utmost from every hint of individuality, of literary or linguistic significance, of humanistic culture. It is, of course, only in the light reflected back from the total Florio that this early piece can be rendered significant and interesting. We associate Florio with a World of Words but the opening (and

probably much earlier-written) dialogues are actually poor in linguistic equipment, Italian and English, and though the presumably later group begin to realize some of Florio's characteristic tastes in expression, their dependence on that European blight, Guevara, robs them of the slight freshness bestowed on the earlier ones by their topicality.

In introducing *First Fruits* Professor del Re has done his best for what is admittedly green fruit. His task was a gallant enterprise carried on in the teeth of difficulties of isolation and delays in the transmission of material. He is clearly convinced that his subject is worth it and, indeed, there can be no doubt that Florio has recently been repaying the labours expended on him. Yet the editor must struggle to maintain an objective view and it seems to me that in some contexts this has been imperfectly done. The claim on p. xxxviii that 'no single individual has done more than Florio to spread Italian culture in England' would be impossible to prove and exemplifies a perennially dangerous type of generalization. On other occasions more realism in the approach or more analysis or distinction is called for. Is it cynical to question whether the assertion (p. xviii) that no one who had read Florio carefully would suspect him of treachery and spying on friends constitutes a legitimate line of argument? The note to p. 100, Ch. xxii, ll. 9-20 (on Peace and War, etc.): 'Attacks on war were frequent at this time when arms had ceased to be a gentlemanly exercise and had become a profession, cf. Erasmus *De Bello*...' calls for further clarifying and distinction in various ways. Other notes are vaguely or misleadingly expressed, e.g. the annotation of *Sheriffes* (p. 57, ll. 27-31). The comment that I found most baffling was a footnote (46) on pp. xv-xvi of the Introduction intended to throw light on the *Arcadia* problems as they may concern Florio. It is true that these problems are thorny and that 'much remains to be investigated fully', but it is impossible to derive from this note a clear idea of the issues involved, and I do not know what there is in Miss Mona Wilson's remarks on Hoskins's *Directions for Speech and Style* (and still less in the book itself) which could have suggested to Professor del Re the description of it as 'strictures of the Arcadian style which certainly must have been displeasing to Sidney's admirers' and, consequently, I see no justification for the subsequent attempt to identify Hoskins with Florio's 'unlearned lover of poetry'.

In this second volume the Japanese printers have drawn a veil of mispunctuation, misspelling and wrested syntax between the reader and the form and style of Introduction and Notes. Professor del Re was unable to correct the proofs and has done his best to cope with the confusion by a lengthy (but not exhaustive) list of *errata*. Not all the awkwardnesses and ambiguities, however, are of a type which can be charged to the compositor, and the editor's enthusiasm and knowledge of his subject are frequently dimmed by haziness of argument and expression.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

The Arbor of Amorous Devices 1597. By Nicholas Breton and others. Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. (*Huntington Library Publications*.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xx+52 pp. 12s. 6d.

The *Arbor* was included in Dr Grosart's edition of Breton's works, but it was there printed from the only copy then known, which has many leaves missing or mutilated. The perfect Britwell copy which reached the Huntington Library in 1919 has now been reproduced in collotype facsimile and is issued with an introduction but (unlike its predecessor in this series, *Brittons Bowre of Delights*) without notes or variants.

In his introduction to the *Bowre* Dr Rollins suggested that the *Arbor* was first published in 1594, and in the present introduction he sets out in detail the entirely convincing evidence for this date. The title of the *Arbor* and the use of Breton's initials on the title-page show that it was intended by the none too scrupulous Richard Jones as a companion volume to the *Bowre*; but it is by no means of equal interest. Only about a third of its contents are now claimed for Breton; this includes six more acrostic poems to Court ladies (compare the *Bowre*), but not, apparently, the two best and best-known poems in the collection—'Come little babe' and the 'Pastorell of Phillis and Coridon'. The latter was attributed to Breton by Dr Rollins on p. 81 of his notes to the *Bowre*; here (p. xv) he includes it in a group of ten poems also in the *Bowre*, and dissociates Breton's name from them all, but without explanation. Of the remaining poems, two are from *Tottel*, one from the *Arcadia*, and one from Richard Edwards's lost play *Palamon and Arcite*. The unclaimed poems bear no signs of individuality. Dr Rollins thinks that the verses 'seem a bit old-fashioned for the year 1597'; perhaps they were permanently old-fashioned. It is time to distinguish between the poetry and the album-verse of the Elizabethan as of the Victorian age; and while it is right that all the miscellanies of the period should be made accessible, the *Arbor* really adds more to our knowledge of the methods of Elizabethan anthologist-publishers than to that of the Elizabethan lyric.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch. Edited by WOLFGANG KELLER. Band 72. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger. 1936. viii+262 pp. 16 M.

The *Jahrbuch* for 1936 once more shows us how Shakespearian scholarship holds its own in Germany. The German Shakespeare Society has indeed lost the services of Professor Hans Hecht as editor, but the veteran Dr Wolfgang Keller still carries on his task with his well-known ability and enthusiasm and the Society's Weimar Meeting in April was again very successful. In Professor W. Deetjen's presidential address reference was made to the new translation of Shakespeare by Hans Rothe on which the opinion of savants had been asked by Dr Göbbels, but which the Shakespeare Society had found unworthy to displace the established

translation of Schlegel and Tieck. It was also recorded that an anonymous donor had given 10,000 marks to found a German-Shakespeare prize for an outstanding work in British literature to be awarded annually by the Universities of Hamburg, Göttingen and Köln, in the hope that it will contribute to good relations between Great Britain and Germany and to peace in Europe. We gratefully reciprocate the generous donor's sentiment. Political causes are responsible for a fall in the number of performances of *Othello*, *The Merchant of Venice* and the *Midsummer Night's Dream* given during the year. In the last case it was Mendelssohn's music that was at fault! On the other hand in Russia, *Romeo and Juliet* was played at Moscow to encourage young Communists to marry! Had it the desired effect?

The 'Festvortrag' delivered by Professor H. Kindermann was on the subject 'Shakespeare and the German Volkstheater'. It is printed in this *Jahrbuch*. It has something of a topical character, Shakespeare being declared to be, in Herder's words, 'an unrivalled poet of Northern humanity'. The plays of the wandering players, in spite of all changes, retained many of Shakespeare's motives and his moral and political outlook, and so represented the Northern drama as against the French, Italian or neo-classic types. And Schlegel's translations are a part of German literature.

The *Jahrbuch* contains also some notable papers which are independent of the Weimar meeting. The first is written by Professor J. Schick with his characteristic brilliance and verve, and is called 'Three men of genius and one man of talent'. It is an attempt to put Bacon in what the writer thinks is his proper place, i.e. in a far lower category than Kepler, Galileo and Shakespeare. It is a splendid effort and contains much truth. But we wince to hear it said of *The Advancement of Learning* 'I think no schoolboy at a gymnasium ever wrote a better essay'. Käthe Stricker in an interesting paper shows how much of Tieck's translation of Shakespeare was the work, carefully revised, of his daughter, Dorothea, and Alan Lang Strout under the heading 'John Wilson ("Christopher North") as a Shakespeare Critic' prints a number of passages disregarded by H. H. Furness, or assigned to another author, and shows thereby Christopher North's brilliant powers of criticism when he is at his best and the aberrations he is capable of on other occasions.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

Nederland en Shakespeare, Achttiende Eeuw en Vroege Romantiek. By R. PENNINK. The Hague: M. Nijhoff. 1936. viii+304 pp. fl. 5.

Dr Pennink describes the fortunes of Shakespeare—his works, his reputation and the aesthetic theories with which he was identified—in the Northern Netherlands (exclusive of Frisia) from Van Effen's 'Critique de Shakespeare' in the *Journal Littéraire* of The Hague in 1717 to the verse-translations of Moulin (*Macbeth*, *Tempest*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Othello*) and Roorda van Eysinga (*Hamlet*) in the middle thirties of last century. The survey of these 120 years is supplemented by a brief

recapitulation of what is known about the earlier stage adaptations of 'Shakespearian' material and by notices of matter which chronologically comes after the versions of Moulin, but belongs rather to an earlier period (Van Lennep's translations of *Romeo and Juliet*, 1852, and *Othello*, 1854; the Hegelian interpretations of Van Ghert and his *Athenaeum*, 1836-9). Nothing comparably full and accurate has appeared in this field before, and everything of importance that could be gleaned from Lina Schneider, De Hoog and Arnold is here resumed and greatly amplified.

Dr Pennink's task, to summarize and criticize all the available documents, implies a division under four heads: (i) comments taken over into Dutch periodicals and works of reference from foreign sources (of some interest for the period 1717-80 alone); (ii) translations, the *termini a quo* being Sebillé's rendering (1740) of the speech 'Cowards die many times before their deaths' (*Julius Caesar*) and the 1778-82 edition of fifteen selected plays; (iii) the more or less independent judgements of Dutch critics, based partly on (i) and (ii); (iv) Shakespearian plays in the Dutch theatre from Mevrouw de Cambon's version of Ducis's *Hamlet* (1777) onwards. The sections devoted to (iii) (pp. 41-7, 52-7, 115-204)—which incidentally print for the first time Kinker's introduction to his MS. translation of *All's Well*—admirably supplement Ralli's *History of Shakespearian Criticism*. Dr Pennink gives a careful study of all the translations, printing long extracts and almost countless phrases or words which enable every reader to formulate his own opinions; he shows (pp. 81 ff.) *inter alia* how superior in accuracy and poetic feeling Brunius's portion of the edition of 1778-82 (vols. iv and v) is to that of the ignorant *anonymi* responsible for the rest.

It is to be hoped that Dr Pennink will supplement the present compilation with another of similar scope, covering the last 100 years, and, since he has eschewed the general chapters with which, for example, Alfonso Par prefaces each Libro of his *Shakespeare en la literatura española*, that from the material thus accumulated he will distil a counterpart to F. Baldensperger's luminous 'Esquisse d'une Histoire de Shakespeare en France' (*Études d'Histoire littéraire*, vol. II), bringing the subject into nearer relation with general movements of taste and thought in the Netherlands. We may then expect some authoritative pronouncement on the big problem still unsolved, the curious lethargy which overtook Dutch commerce with Shakespeare after Van Effen. How much had a general ignorance of English before the establishment of the Hoogere Burger School in 1863 to do with it? How much the failure to produce round about 1790 a native critic comparable with August Wilhelm Schlegel or Mme de Staël? How much the prestige of Bilderdijk, who, hostile to so much that 'ruwe doch menschkundige' Shakespeare stood for, could yet be so unexpectedly generous in his admiration? How much the fact that a large semi-educated stratum of society identified Shakespeare with perversions like Ducis's *Hamlet*, Nieuwenhuyzen's *Desdemona*, Weisse's *Romeo und Julia*, Beck's *Quälgeister* and, very sensibly, concluded he was not worth bothering about? One would welcome a little more information about the popularity of these per-

versions, since Te Winkel's *Ontwikkelingsgang* and Worp's *Drama en Tooneel in Nederland* are weakest in dealing with the theatres' and companies' actual repertory. There are hints in Dr Pennink's book (pp. 264-6) that the plays in question were often presented; on the other hand, Zubli, himself a perverter of *Hamlet*, in invoking in 1800 the inspiration of the illustrious dead, does not include Shakespeare among them (*Aanspraak van de Acteurs en Actrices by de Opening van den Amsteldamschen Schouwburg*).¹

BRIAN W. DOWNS.

CAMBRIDGE.

Representative English Comedies. Edited by CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY and ALWIN THALER. Vol. IV. *Dryden and his Contemporaries Cowley to Farquhar*. New York: the Macmillan Company. 1936. xii + 777 pp. 15s.

The series of *Representative English Comedies* edited by the late Professor C. M. Gayley has achieved a well-deserved reputation as one of the most notable contributions of American scholarship to English studies. Professor Gayley published the third volume of the series in 1914. He died in July 1932, but in 1923 Professor Alwin Thaler was by his request associated with him in the general editorship, and collaborated with him in the preparation of a fourth and last volume. The publication of this book was delayed by the economic disturbances in America; it now appears nearly four years after Professor Gayley's death, and it forms a worthy memorial to that eminent scholar, to whom it is fittingly dedicated.

This volume deals with the second half of the seventeenth century, and follows the general plan of the series which, in Professor Gayley's words, was 'to indicate the development of English comedy by a selection of its representative specimens, arranged, when possible, in the order of their production and accompanied by critical and historical studies' together with 'occasional monographs intended to represent minor dramatists'. The selection of authors and plays in this volume seems to represent the taste of the nineteenth rather than that of the twentieth century. No objection can, of course, be made to the inclusion of plays by Dryden, Wycherley, Congreve, Vanbrugh and Farquhar, but it is rather surprising to find Etherege and Shadwell wholly unrepresented either by plays or by monographs on their work, while a comparatively unimportant play like Cowley's *Cutter of Coleman Street* is printed in full, and a monograph on the uninspiring John Crowne by the late Sir A. W. Ward occupies ten pages. Etherege's *She Wou'd If She Cou'd* and *The Man of Mode* are surely comedies far more representative of the age than Cowley's rather amateurish play, while a monograph on Shadwell would have been much more useful to the student than an account of the work of Crowne.

¹ Another poem of his, *Aan de verdienstelyke Acteurs en Actrices die het treurspel Hamlet verwonderlyk fraai hebben uitgevoerd* (1786), gives the cast of the first performance in his version.

However, no anthology pleases everyone's taste, and the purchaser of this excellently printed and produced volume will possess carefully edited texts of six very interesting comedies of the age of Dryden, and some valuable and scholarly essays including a masterly study of Congreve by Professor G. R. Noyes and particularly useful introductions to Vanbrugh by Professor Alwin Thaler and to Farquhar by Professor Tucker Brooke.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Plays about the Theatre in England from 'The Rehearsal' in 1671 to the Licensing Act in 1737; or, The Self-Conscious Stage and its Burlesque and Satirical Reflections in the Age of Criticism. By DANE FARNSWORTH SMITH. New York and London: Oxford University Press. 1936. xxii+287 pp. 17s.

This volume, the ample title of which fairly well defines its scope, is by way of being an anthology of dramatic comment on the theatre in the Age of Reason. The author has diligently accumulated from the 'comedies, farces, burlesques, operas, and important pantomimes' of his period whatever is said about 'the dramatists, the managers, the actors, the spectators, and the theatres', and has either quoted this in full or has given generous selections accompanied by detailed descriptions of the plots of the plays involved. The reader is thereby saved the tedium of consulting many a dull play and can confine his attention to the relatively few pieces which, even in selection, stand out head and shoulders above the rest. One does, in fact, wonder whether Mr Smith has not rather overcrowded his book with unimportant detail. Even in dealing with *The Rehearsal* he carries conscientious analysis to an extreme point, and the authors of this piece might well have found a further topic for their wit if they could have foreseen the twenty-two pages of numbered sections, sub-sections and sub-sub-sections in which the objects of their satire are tabulated.

From *The Rehearsal* until 1714 comment on the theatre is practically confined to scenes or snatches of dialogue in the regular comedies, and the behaviour of the audience, more particularly of its amateur critics, receives the brunt of the attack. The second part of Vanbrugh's *Aesop* (1697), however, is worth noting as an onslaught on Betterton and the other actors who had recently rebelled against the patentees of Drury Lane and established themselves at Lincoln's Inn Fields; while to the same year belongs the anonymous *Female Wits*, written in ridicule of the three leading women dramatists of the time, Mrs Manley, Mrs Pix and Mrs Trotter. Gay's farces, *The What D'Ye Call It* (1715), a burlesque of the types of drama then popular, and *Three Hours after Marriage* (1717), with its renewed mockery of the female dramatist and the critic, strike a higher level of humour and wit. For the next ten years foreign importations, notably the Italian harlequinade and Italian opera, are the chief objects of undistinguished dramatic satire. Thereafter, beginning with *The Beggar's Opera* (1728), comes so prolific a spate of plays indulging political as well as social and literary satire that, to save its face, the

Walpole government forced through the Licensing Act of 1737. Fielding, thanks rather to his robustness than to any great artistry, is the dominating figure of this period, and his strife with the Cibbers is the principal dramatic theme. Throughout the whole period surveyed in this volume *The Rehearsal* maintained its popularity, and, although its devices were frequently imitated, it remained to the last unequalled in brilliance and effectiveness.

In his conclusion Mr Smith justly stresses the moral of his story, that the critical choked the creative faculty in the dramatists of the time. They scoffed at the dramatic medium in which they were working. They ridiculed the mechanical devices of the theatre and the personalities of the actors, and so destroyed what little chance of stage illusion survived the familiar back-stage intercourse between players and members of the audience. Their cavalier treatment of the audience itself provided the final obstacle to that imaginative co-operation between author, actor and audience which enables great drama to flourish.

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift, D.D.

By H. TEERINK. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1937. xii + 434 pp. 20 guilders.

Samuel Richardson: a Bibliographical Record of his Literary Career with Historical Notes. By WILLIAM MERRITT SALE, Jr. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xxiv + 141 pp. 22s. 6d.

These valuable books are two of the latest and most welcome successes in the recent bibliographical campaign on English territory, which will soon yield Andrew Block's long-needed supplement to Esdaile's *List of English Tales and Prose Romances before 1740*, this third, happily, by an Englishman. Dr Teerink's is a portly volume of well over 400 pages, cataloguing in full detail the whole miscellaneous output of the great and prolific Swift, not excepting those writings which must still be classified as doubtful. It is an arduous piece of work that he has brought to a conclusion after a number of industrious years. Esdaile spoke of Swift as 'a remote Himalayan peak for the bibliographer to conquer'. The existing bibliography by Spencer Jackson (1908) had proved far from complete; the only others did not pretend to completeness. Dr Teerink was under the initial handicap of having to learn the technique. He evolved a plan which, as he remarks, may not be strictly orthodox; but he forestalls criticism from the professional by explaining that he has endeavoured to make this an instrument for practical use, and the literary worker will find nothing to grumble at. He has listed all known editions of collected and separate works, excluding English, French, Dutch, and German 'Gullivers' after 1850, and ignoring manuscripts, but dealing as far as possible with earlier translations, and also with most of the biographical and critical material on Swift. The order followed is chronological, strictly so, except that editions appearing in different years and succeeding editions of separate works have been grouped together in order to bring

out their relations to one another; in fact, the more complicated relations are illustrated with diagrams and all the notes and explanations necessary to make this a history of the literature by or about Swift. In the transcription of titles, the usual rules have been punctiliously observed as to sizes and collations. Dr Teerink has, however, eschewed the use of inches and millimetres, very reasonably preferring to go by actual visible sizes in applying the terms 'folio', 'quarto', etc. rather than by the folding of the sheets. In the first four sections, dealing with collected works, the *Tale of a Tub*, *Gulliver*, and separate works such as essays, poems, pamphlets, and editorial matter, 828 items are listed; two sections respectively labelled 'Doubtful' and 'Biography, criticism, etc.', bring the total up to 1574. There are two indexes, of titles and of names, the names of Pope, Steele, Jonathan Smedley, John Forster, Leslie Stephen, and Harold Williams bulking largest in the latter. This is an invaluable addition to Martinus Nijhoff's library of bibliographical works of reference.

Professor Sale deals with a much less formidable subject than Swift, and, not aiming at the same exhaustive completeness as Dr Teerink's bibliography, manages to dispose of the business in 141 pages—which, by the way, are an example of agreeable display, with their neat variations of type and miniature facsimiles of title-pages. It is candidly offered as a contribution of bibliographical materials for the study of Richardson's literary career, with the forecast that further 'variants and issues' 'will in all likelihood be discovered'. Further information is invited. This, in fact, is a short history of Richardson's works, as much as, or even more than, a mere bibliography. The life of Richardson is summarized—the young man who chose to be a printer 'that he might gratify his thirst for reading', who had not only exercised his pen in writing love-letters for his female friends, but had also carried on a long correspondence with a gentleman whom he thought 'a master of the epistolary style'. Thus he came easily and naturally to the application of his own mastery of the style in *Pamela*. The author rejects the ascription of the essay attributed to Richardson in No. 6 of the *True Briton*, and discusses with negative results the view that Richardson wrote or had a hand in some other works. He, too, confesses that he is not an experienced bibliographer, and that this is a tentative effort, in which he has been indebted to Dr Greg's 'Formulary of Collation'. Anyhow, he deserves credit for conscientious observance of the rules, and for furnishing Richardson's students with a useful tool. The largest of the three parts gives the novels, the works edited by Richardson, those in which he collaborated, and his pamphlets; the second part, his contributions to periodicals, and the third those works—*Shamela* is of course the best-known—which were 'inspired in whole or in part by the publication of Richardson's novels'. It should be stated that it is a bibliography of contemporary or nearly contemporary works; later editions and modern studies do not come into its scope.

E. A. BAKER.

LONDON.

Poor Collins. His Life, His Art, and His Influence. By EDWARD GAY AINSWORTH, Jr. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press; London: H. Milford. xii+340 pp. 15s.

The lachrymose title of this book is drawn from a letter of Thomas Warton and from part of a repeated phrase in Johnson's letters. It suggests that this is one of those biographies which give more prominence to the capers of the author than to the historical behaviour of the subject. But the reader soon finds that the sub-title represents the book more justly than its title; that, after a full, careful, uninflated biographical chapter, Professor Ainsworth proceeds to make Collins's important historical position clearer than it has yet been made, and to attempt with some success an estimate of the 'non-historical' Collins, that part of him which would have been the same in any age. If at times the book reads thinly, it is partly the fault of Collins. Unlike Gray—who was from the start more solid and who also had time to mature—Collins is often too empty. He too often fails to require his critic to work hard to get understanding.

In the useful chapter on personification, one may note that Professor Ainsworth fails to make the valid distinction between what is personification and what is not or is not necessarily so. In an age which used capitals freely, not every capitalized abstract noun was seen by the poet as a person. For example, in the line

The tender Thought on thee shall dwell

'Thought' cannot be personified. One should not, therefore, complain (p. 113) that 'In some instances the personification amounts to no more than the presence of a capital letter' and give as example the lines:

Where is thy native simple Heart,
Devote to Virtue, Fancy, Art?

Professor Ainsworth has done good work in citing 'sources' for much of Collins's diction. Such sources can never be finally and certainly collected, but Professor Ainsworth makes a serious omission when he neglects the verse translations of Homer and the Latin poets. A fair number of Collins's words have had a previous history in Sandys's Ovid, Dryden's Virgil, Pope's Homer, etc. The use of *substantive*+y as an adjective had been common in English poetry since Shakespeare. Professor Ainsworth has noted this form in Milton, but Milton himself learns it, along with many other things, from Sandys. So that Collins's 'beamy', 'gleamy', 'wavy'—words which play an important part in his characteristic effect of 'evanescence'—are really quotations. 'Beamy' has an interesting history. Dryden uses it in his Virgil mainly (perhaps entirely) in the sense of wooden ('beamy spear') or of a stag's antlers ('Three beamystags'). Trapp applies 'beamy' to the sun (1709 *Miscellany*, p. 379), and again in the same volume (p. 427) the sun for Tickell is 'the Beamy God'. The word had been applied occasionally, though insignificantly, in this way earlier (see *N.E.D.*). Pope uses the word often in his Homer for javelins (cf. Dryden), blades, falchions, the day, light, and lustre. (Rowe's *Royal Convert*—1707—had used it with 'gold'.) So

that Collins's use comes very late in the day. Collins's 'gleamy' has an earlier history in Pope's *Iliad* and Rowe's *Pharsalia*. His 'sheeny' has an earlier history in Milton (noted by Professor Ainsworth) and Fenton (see *N.E.D.*).

In discussing Collins's lines:

Whilst *Vengeance*, in the lurid Air,
Lifts her red Arm, expos'd and bare,

Professor Ainsworth has noted Horace, *Odes*, I, ii, 2-4, and Milton's 'Arm again his red right arm to plague us', but not the more important passage from Dryden's *Æneis* (vi, 800-1):

But he, the king of heav'n, obscure on high,
Bar'd his red arm....

(Virgil has nothing corresponding to these last four words.) Moreover, Pope's *Odyssey* (xii, 456) borrows the phrase from Dryden for Jove:

Lo! my red arm I bare...

and cf. 'Jove's red arm' at xxiv, 623.

The word *brede* (*Ode to Evening*) has more certain sources than Milton's *braid* (*Comus*) which Professor Ainsworth suggests. Milton had used the word in prose, and Dryden in his *Essay on the Georgics* writes 'in a curious Brede of Needle-work'. But in poetry the first use seems that of Philips in *Cyder* (1708), where 'watry brede' is used for the rainbow. Pope employs the word for Penelope's web (*Odyssey*, xix, 179) and Akenside in 1744 follows Philips in applying it to the rainbow. The exact sense of the word was never more than vaguely determined. Some of these instances are noted in *N.E.D.*, which seems to indicate that Professor Ainsworth might have consulted it more often.

Pope's Homer is certainly one of the 'sources' for Collins's mood and words of tenderness—pity, melting, tender, pale; though even here one must remember that Pope himself is improving on earlier translations of Latin epics which exaggerated their pathos.

The above notes are merely indications of Collins's debt to an area of English poetry which has been neglected by modern scholars. A thorough study would discover much more of the same kind.

(The date 1737 given on p. 41 for Spence's *Essay on Mr. Pope's Odyssey* is that of the second edition, the first appearing in 1726.)

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

The Waverley Novels and their Critics. By JAMES HILLHOUSE. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xiv + 360 pp. 16s.

This is a good and interesting book, partly because of the material and Professor Hillhouse's management of it, and partly because its uncertainty of aim and treatment sets the reader's mind usefully and agreeably to work. First, it is not quite clear what Professor Hillhouse means to be

at—the annals of Scott's reputation, or the criticism of Scott as a field for observing the development either of critical method or of literary taste. But, secondly, he is saved from making what (to judge from extant examples) might have been a devastatingly wrong or devastatingly dull book by his real appreciation of Sir Walter and of the novels. The long and conscientious struggle with the material has not killed it, nor even the difficult task of arrangement. Professor Hillhouse is, accordingly, uncertain in his attitude to the critics. They are phenomena, towards which the observer should maintain a correctly dispassionate demeanour. But he cannot help taking sides: and in these days of literary geology it is no small virtue. One feels indeed a naughty regret that he is so dispassionate to some critics—mainly recent ones—as, for instance, to the hangers-on of the C 3 school of literature that dominated the 1920's. One guesses what he wanted to say, and wishes he had said it roundly. The sum total of the book is really an appreciation of Sir Walter, and it is a pity so well-informed and genial a critic did not condense here and there, to make room for more of himself.

What he has proved is, that Scott is a major writer, for, like Chaucer and Shakespeare and the first rank generally, he was correctly estimated in his own day—on the whole, the early critics come out very well—and opinion has changed very little. Much of the interest then, lies in the critics themselves. Where two thoroughbred Scots like Carlyle and W. P. Ker differ, one marks the essential Ker, and tries to calculate how much of the other is theory, how much dyspepsia, and how much mere Annandale. Professor Hillhouse is not quite there yet—his vague reference to 'a divine named McCrie' shows that he has not disentangled the Scottish breeds. Indeed he might be thought to have narrowed his field of vision a trifle. One would like to be assured that he is sound on Galt; and when he asks 'Are modern readers drawn even to *Castle Rackrent*, to say nothing of *The Absentee* and *Belinda*?' the reviewer (holding up his hand for one) is made uncertain of some of the author's other pronouncements even on Sir Walter himself. No one can complain that Professor Hillhouse ignores the criticism of Scott implicit in an imitation like parts of *Cyril Thornton* and in the style of *The Annals of the Parish* and *Ringan Gilhaize*: the line must be drawn somewhere. He might have observed, in reply to the 'debunkers' of Scott's 'chivalry', that Scott himself was the first 'debunker', in his picture of the unromantic Border reivers in *The Abbot* and *The Monastery*. The wild chronology of *The Lay*, again, wherein Auld Wat of Harden and Belted Will Howard lead their troops at a date when one was about six years of age and the other yet unborn, points to the central truth that what Scott looked for was, first and last, dynamic imagery. Professor Hillhouse has now studied criticism; he shows himself capable of making his own, and should, for he can enjoy as well as describe.

W. L. RENWICK.

STOCKSFIELD, NORTHUMBERLAND.

Coleridge's Miscellaneous Criticism. Edited by THOMAS M. RAYSOR.
London: Constable. 1936. xvi + 468 pp. 24s.

This new volume of Coleridge's literary criticism, edited by Professor Raysor, contains the non-Shakespearian lectures from the 1818 course, interspersed with notes and marginalia; over a hundred pages of other marginalia; Coleridge's four early reviews of Gothic novels; and extracts on literary subjects from the Crabb Robinson papers and from *Table Talk*. As in his two volumes of Coleridge's *Shakespearian Criticism*, Professor Raysor's main concern is to provide a more reliable text than the previously accepted one, and to supplement the familiar material with additions from the surviving Coleridge manuscripts. The most important of the 'new additions' are several sets of marginalia, notably from two sets of Anderson's *British Poets* and from a set of the *Waverley* novels.

This book is less interesting than its predecessor partly because a good deal of the material on which H. N. Coleridge relied when he first published the *Literary Remains* has perished, and is therefore not available for checking his text, and partly because less new manuscript material of importance is included. It is in this second respect that Professor Raysor has missed his opportunity in a manner which is difficult to explain. He is one of the fortunate few who have had access to Coleridge's note-books, but he uses them only once, viz. for the text of the lecture on 'Poesy or Art' (pp. 204-13). In fact, he seems deliberately to have eschewed anything which has any connection with the note-books, even such relevant extracts as were printed in *Omniana* and *Anima Poetae*, which should surely have been included here if extracts from Crabb Robinson and *Table Talk* were to be given a place. The note-books, however, still contain a fairly substantial body of unpublished literary criticism on a wide variety of topics. There is hardly enough of it for a separate book, and Professor Raysor would have greatly enhanced the value of this volume had he incorporated it here—even at the expense of some of the marginalia which he so regretfully includes (Preface, p. ix). He would then have had some claims to our gratitude for having presented a reasonably complete corpus of Coleridge's literary criticism.

Since the need for a more reliable text is the principal justification for the re-editing of the greater part of this book, it is the text which demands attention. Professor Raysor has scarcely a good word to say for H. N. Coleridge, who, in his opinion, only further mangled the *disjecta membra* he attempted to reduce to order. It should be remembered, however, that H. N. Coleridge believed that the most useful service he could do for the memory of his uncle was to present the scraps and jottings, which had survived, in the most coherent and widely acceptable form, and that E. H. Coleridge, who knew as much about the requirements of exact scholarship as any man, still found it necessary to pursue a similar editorial policy when he brought out *Anima Poetae* nearly sixty years later. Further, it seems likely that, in his strictures on H. N. Coleridge for tampering with his material, Professor Raysor has underestimated not only the extent to which Coleridge's manuscripts have been lost but also the extent to which Coleridge himself rewrote and recast his

lecture notes. For instance, there survive three versions of the lecture on Shakespeare's Poems (only two of which have been printed by Professor Raysor in his earlier volumes), and on pp. 28-32 of the present volume two versions are fitted into one. Again, some of the surviving notes, such as those on Massinger (pp. 93-7) and Sterne (pp. 121-6), have a line drawn down the page cancelling them, as though to indicate that they had been supplanted by a later version. Thus, although H. N. Coleridge undoubtedly 'edited' the text to excess, and one cannot but be grateful to the new editor for restoring it wherever possible, it is unjust to condemn the earlier one too sweepingly.

It is also true that H. N. Coleridge, as Professor Raysor points out (p. 97, n. 2), was capable of reading 'sacred beauties' for 'sound beatings' (in fact, Coleridge's scribble is sometimes very difficult to decipher), but a comparison of Professor Raysor's text with such of the manuscript originals as are in the British Museum has produced an *errata* list sufficiently formidable to reflect on his own editorial capacities:

P. 19	14	For	'and'	read	'end'
23	15	"	'the distracting of'	"	'the distracting Interval of'
23	27	"	'expectations at'	"	'expectations of'
23	28	"	'Latin books'	"	'Latin works'
24	10	"	'not'	"	'or not'
24	12	"	'there is'	"	'is there'
29	2	"	'ignorance and'	"	'ignorance or'
29	5	"	'the past sense'	"	'the first sense'
30	3-4	"	'in disguise'	"	'we disguise'
31	8-9	"	'persons . . . personifications'	"	'person . . . personification'
42	3	"	'excellencies'	"	'excellences'
44	3	"	'him in the <i>homo generalis</i> '	"	'him—the <i>homme generale</i> '
					[sic]
44	12	"	'talking king! I am the king'	"	'talking—King? I am the King'
88	12	"	'μισηρόν'	"	'μισητέον'
94	31	"	'Vide III'	"	'V[ol]. III'
94	32	"	'mixed'	"	'mixes'
95	11	"	'as the heart etc.'	"	'as the heart and the brain etc.—the heart etc.'
95	22	"	'pole, a servility of sentiment, a partisanship'	"	'pole,—servility of sentiment—partisanship'
117	5	"	'hence'	"	'thence'
117	9	"	'an'	"	'any'
118	13	"	'rank'	"	'rank, etc.'
120	15	"	'Gasconade'	"	'Gasconader'
122	20	"	'is'	"	'a'
122	22	"	'a closet'	"	'in a closet'
126	note a	"	'combinations, p. 108'	"	'combinations, 108'
126	note b	"	'Jacobinism, 393'	"	'Jacobinism, p. 393'
198	2	"	'in many'	"	'in too many'
198	4	"	'could'	"	'need'
199	4-5	"	'act of judgment'	"	'act of the judgment'

Although the original is not accessible, there is also a palpable error on p. 333, at line 2. Scott, in *The Pirate*, had written of the 'many prodigious stories of these marine monsters (the Kraken and the sea-snake)'; Professor Raysor makes Coleridge say in the margin: 'I believe in the

Sea-snake; Robert Southey in the *Viraker*;¹ and Linnaeus in both.' Even without Scott's text to help him, he ought to have remembered that, among the 'thousand things' Coleridge broached during the two miles for which Keats walked at his side, there was talk of 'Monsters—the Kraken—Mermaids—Southey believes in them'.

A few other notes are appended:

P. 71, l. 13. The general reader is surely entitled to be told that the 'Ni. Br.' of the extract from *The Scornful Lady*, which Colman interpreted as Nicholas Broughton, and Coleridge emended to Mi[chael] Dr[ayton], is in reality Nicholas Breton.

P. 76, l. 4. Professor Raysor's suggested correction of 'Ye Pus-facti Homos' to 'Puris facti homines' obscures Coleridge's joke.

P. 144, l. 33. 'nice' seems to be a misprint for 'vice'.

P. 242, n. 3. Apparently Professor Raysor is unaware that no known copy of Fulke Greville's *Certaine Learned and Elegant Workes* contains pages 1 to 22.

P. 268, ll. 32-4 and note. The 16th of March, 1824, was a Tuesday, while that of 1804 was not. The story of the volume of Luther's *Table Talk*, referred to by S.T.C., is told in full in the *Ashley Catalogue*, VIII, 99-102.

R. C. BALD.

STELLENBOSCH.

Letters of Hartley Coleridge. Edited by GRACE EVELYN GRIGGS and EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1937. xv + 328 pp. 15s.

Hartley Coleridge is a pathetic rather than a tragic figure. At twenty-three he allowed his loss of the fellowship at Oriel, which he held for one year only, to blast his life. He refused to accept the £300 which the college offered as compensation for dismissing him for drunkenness at the time, but significantly by 1823 the money had been paid with his authorization to his mother. After 1820 his letters show constantly the scarlet thread of self-condemnation, but rarely self-pity: 'my premature winter of the soul' (May 1823), 'my soul-withering procrastination' (August 1834), 'my deadly foe despondency' (October 1845). His letters are happiest when he is at work: as teacher at Ambleside in 1823, at Sedburgh, Yorkshire, in 1837, and particularly as literary assistant to the publisher F. E. Bingley at Leeds in 1832: 'Literary employment agrees both with my mind and body', he wrote his protesting mother in November of that year. Along with his self-frustration, his inability to meet life on the terms that life demands, go whimsicality, a yearning affection for his relatives and a kindness for his friends that are very touching, and intellectual independence. Though his family were conservatives, as were his friends in the Lake District, he was himself a mild Whig or 'liberal conservative', asserting in 1820 that if Brougham cannot come in for Westmorland 'at least the Lowthers should be thrown out', and referring in 1836 to 'the idolized abominations of the old system'.

¹ My italics.

Twenty years before Huxley he writes, realistically, September 1837: 'There were not above three boys among my pupils to whom Latin will ever be of any use, except, perhaps to thrust them into professions for which they have no vocation.'

The chief value of Hartley Coleridge's letters lies in the pictures they give of the Lake poets and their families in the later years: the reverence, understanding, and love for S. T. Coleridge, the superlative praise of 'Uncle' Southey as man, of Wordsworth as man and poet. Not that a shrewdness and piquancy do not at times creep into these pictures. In 1826 he alludes to Wordsworth's

gasconading prefaces, and that illtimed blundering Supplement, which is as full of sophistry and unfounded assertion as an egg's full of meat. Wordsworth's prose has done more to retard his fame, than the *simplest* of his poems;

and in 1830 he writes:

W. W. to me seems yearly less of the Poet, and more of the respectable, talented, hospitable Country gentleman. Unfortunately, his weakest points, his extreme irritability of self-approbation and parsimony of praise to contemporary authors are much *in statu quo*.

Yet later in the same letter he writes:

I am afraid there is little hope at present of another portion of the *Recluse*, but it must delight every lover of mankind to see how the influence of Wordsworth's poetry is diverging, spreading over society, benefiting the heart and soul of the Species, and indirectly operating upon thousands, who haply, never read, or will read, a single page of his fine Volumes.

Other equally ecstatic passages might be quoted. The highest tribute appears also, to a less significant person, the 'pensive Sara' of earlier years, who considered her son even in maturity a little boy and who sent him advice, admonition, and apparel in large quantities.

Hartley Coleridge has been fortunate in his editors. With only a minimum of commentary, they put full emphasis on the letters themselves. They are sympathetic, and remarkably unobtrusive.

ALAN LANG STROUT.

LUBBOCK, TEXAS.

The Magic Plant. The Growth of Shelley's Thought. By CARL GRABO. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xii+450 pp. 18s.

Shelley's Religion. By ELLSWORTH BARNARD. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: H. Milford. 1937. xii+320 pp. 16s.

Power and Elusiveness in Shelley. By OSCAR W. FIRKINS. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; London: H. Milford. 1937. iv+188 pp. 11s. 6d.

Shelley's critics offer a perfect illustration of the dependence of literary estimates upon moral and philosophical assumptions, avowed or unavowed. Those who find his subject-matter insubstantial differ from Shelley in not finding the world itself insubstantial; critics of an idealist persuasion find in him the truest of all subject-matters; those to whom

nothing is so real as its hypothetical causes vapour him away in a mist of psychology; while for those who love above all a comforting absurdity, his wrongs repent to witticisms. The vitality of his poetry purely as expression is proved by the lively interest it continues to excite, and by constantly renewed efforts to describe the experience, ideas, and faith of which it is the expression.

Two of the present books deal with Shelley's ideas. Professor Grabo, who has already written three shorter studies of the poet, now surveys the entire development of his thought, supplying a little biographical matter, carefully chosen to relate the growth of his ideas to that of his experience. There is no bibliography, no footnotes, no references even for the quotations, no references to other writers on Shelley; nevertheless the book seems to have been written with scrupulous care. It covers all the directions of Shelley's thought; there is a certain stress on the importance of his scientific interests, particularly in electricity, and much emphasis on the platonic and (less clearly presented) Neoplatonic elements in his thought and imagery. Professor Barnard has a more restricted theme, confining himself to Shelley's ideas on the relation of the universe and the mind, on good and evil, God, the soul, and love. The poet is represented as moving steadily towards an attitude closely approximating to Christian asceticism. He was not a pantheist; he believed in a God, even in a sense a personal God, and in the immortality (but not personal immortality) of the soul; imagination as he conceived it was the equivalent of grace. Mr Barnard is bolder than Mr Grabo, and his ardour may have carried him a little too far toward the end of his book. Suffering, deeper intuition, absorption in Plato, had enlarged Shelley's spiritual resources, the study of Dante and Calderon brought certain Christian elements into his thought—but did not all that still remained in him of the libertarian individualist fix a great gulf between his outlook and the noblest theology of the Church he attacked to the end? Mr Barnard supplies a full bibliography and abundant documentation.

These books, both products of scholarly devotion, have, to some extent, a common purpose and substance. Both declare that Shelley's ideas have never been adequately considered; he was more than an emotional visionary, more even than 'a nerve o'er which do creep the else unfelt oppressions of this earth'. He was a moralist, a social reformer, a religious philosopher, whose ideas ought to be considered in their own right. (Mr Barnard's pugnacious footnotes would by themselves dispel the impression left by Mr Grabo that nobody has ever seriously considered Shelley's ideas at all.) They show that his outlook developed rapidly during his short maturity (he said himself that he had lived a hundred years), and accuse the critics, not very justly, of failing to realize that his early materialist rationalism was never complete, and that it quickly gave way to the philosophic and even mystical idealism which informed his greater work. Mr Grabo gives some information about Shelley's philosophic guides, Mr Barnard disavows any interest in sources; but both are more concerned to formulate the poet's views than to account

for them. They agree in insisting that his idealism was no product of childish self-deception, but was achieved in the face of a terribly clear and fearless recognition of the world and its ways; he came to know evil too well to expect a millennium, and his heaven was not of this earth. Mr Grabo indeed calls Shelley a great realist.

There are considerable differences of tone and attitude. Mr Barnard is, I suppose, the younger and certainly the more confident partisan, laying about him among the critics with every sign of enjoyment. Mr Eliot has a sharp knock on p. 6; Clutton Brock is annihilated on p. 104; a certain treatise 'could only have been written by a person whose intellect has been corrupted by the study of modern psychology'. Towards the end his Shelley becomes a truly Christ-like figure; the poet of *Epipsychidion* is presented as a platonic ascetic, his glowing sensual imagery explained as it might be in the work of a Christian mystic. Mr Grabo's restrained and sympathetic account of Shelley's later relations with women lies on a more earthly plane and will not content his fellow-critic. On the other hand Mr Grabo is surely inclined to find too much intellectual coherence in the poet's philosophical ideas; he thinks that his poetry was an accident, a *pis aller*, that he might have been a practical reformer, a scientist, a philosopher. Mr Barnard, who handles the abstract issues more firmly, regards Shelley's thought as subtle and profound rather than systematic. It is certainly much easier to think of his mind as religious than as truly philosophical, penetrating and far-reaching though some of his speculations are. Mr Barnard has frequent and useful quotations from Newman and F. H. Bradley, who seem to have contributed much to a well-defined and vigorous outlook very different from the left wing orthodoxy of Mr Grabo.

Shelley's poetry, like that of Crashaw or Traherne, hangs upon the verge of what is poetically impossible. His caravan starts for the dawn of nothing. A little more religious, a little more metaphysical, and there could be no poetry at all. It is not the white light of the One but the broken lights that make the picture of life for most men and most poets, however deeply they seek an inner harmony. In one place Mr Barnard writes almost disparagingly of Shakespeare as one of the 'lovers of imperfection'. Need we be ashamed of feeling at home with Shakespeare? The world may at times seem a stage, an insubstantial pageant, but to most of us it is a very absorbing pageant; we endeavour to understand the mystics only with considerable imaginative effort. For Shelley the external world was transient and unreal, time, space, and personality illusions. The world, which has usually felt more at home in Dante's Hell than in his Heaven, is for the most part a good deal happier than Shelley was to live 'within the dreary cone of this life's shade' (a Dantesque expression, by the way).

Such reflections are well illustrated by our third book, in a sense the only one of the three which deals with Shelley's poetry. This short study by the late Professor Firkins treats some aspects of the poet's imagery; its author casually avows at the outset a poor opinion of his intellectual powers and had probably never given much thought to them. His

general theme is that this master of abstractions delighted above all in images that combine 'momentousness of import with indistinctness of material'—the impressive vague. He uses the words *power* and *powerful* repeatedly, with doubtful meaning; the ideas of space and time are 'powerful and indistinct', dreams are 'powerful and intangible'. But a poet who wants to write about God and eternity is of course committed to the impressive and ill-defined. The author says at last, 'I have valued the proposition almost as much for the sake of the evidence as the evidence for the sake of the proposition'. To me the proposition is uninteresting, the evidence very interesting indeed, and so are the often acute analytic comments. Lists of images are collected under such headings as *Space, Time, the Passions, Sleep, Dreams, Unearthly Beings, Landscape, Wind, Cloud, Light, Sound, Odour*. Particularly illuminating are the sections concerning the presentation of mind in terms of matter and matter in terms of mind; that the boundary between the two was indistinct to Shelley in experience as well as in thought appears admirably in the images selected. Interesting also are the sections called *Co-ordination* and *Assimilation* which illustrate the poet's habit of interfusing sight, sound, and colour images, giving them an abstract and ethereal effect as of spiritual emanations; and those dealing with images of penetration, absorption, and effluence, effective solvents of the sharp outlines of matter. There are oddities too. The final chapters of *Pantheism* and *Metaphysics* seem rather ill-provided excursions after the other two books. (And one may remark that the recurrent images of stream, ocean, and cave are well accounted for in Mr Grabo's platonic researches.) However, this book is concerned not with what Shelley thought but with how he thought. It demonstrates how unstable to him was the world of the senses, how wonderfully subtle his perception of the impalpable and his power to express it, how inevitably such a mind, seeking formulae, must resort to idealist philosophy or religious metaphysics—and how much more his mind was that of a poet than that of a philosopher. These seem to me the 'propositions' which the author's 'evidence' best proves. His book is complementary to the other two; all of them are in their own ways worthy of their subject.

ROSS D. WALLER.

MANCHESTER.

The Fabulous Opera. A Study of Continuity in French and English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century. By D. G. VAN DER VAT. Groningen: J. B. Wolters. 1936. 212 pp. fl. 3.90.

This is a study in aesthetics rather than in criticism. The author is an idealist in philosophy, an unwavering Crocean, a believer in 'pure poetry', and has read the Abbé Bremond with approval. He has also read Mr Richards, since he refers to him in a note on p. 181; but apparently without alarm, defending his system against what seem to be much more ancient enemies. The general aesthetic ground is treated in the introduction under three heads: *Imagination and Intellect*—poetry is created by the intuition (the 'poetical faculty') and 'has nothing whatever to do

with the intellect'; *Poetry and Practical Activities*—poetry is an autonomous activity and has 'nothing to do with' convictions, morals, utility; *Poetry and Reality*—poetry is a mode of contemplating reality, which is spiritual and transcendent, so that 'imitation and art exclude each other' and 'all realists are deplorable artistic mistakes'. It is a familiar position, rather crudely stated, offered not merely as the author's own view but also as a synthesis of the views of various poets of nineteenth-century France and England. Three times over the following poets are summoned to uphold in turn the three cardinal doctrines: Blake, Coleridge (whose 'ideas are rather complicated, owing to his inability to think clearly'), Wordsworth (a rather surprising witness, but 'he had some notions of artistic integrity'), Keats, Shelley, Browning, Rossetti (was he really 'troubled about the social utility of the poet'?—the idea seems to rest on an imperfect understanding of his Sonnet 65), Francis Thompson, Yeats, and A. E.; Sainte-Beuve, De Nerval, Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Laforgue, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam, Verlaine, Mallarmé (the difficulty he found in denuding words of their 'meaning' raises radical questions not very adequately dealt with) and Maeterlinck. The theories of E. A. Poe, because of their influence on Baudelaire, are always inserted before that writer's; although 'negligible as a poet and little better as a critic', he was doctrinally sound. Only those whose ideas can be shown to be similar are treated, and only poets, so that some very important propagators of this view of literature (for example Flaubert and Pater) are absent; among witnesses whose evidence might have been expected perhaps the most notable absentee is Swinburne. Wilde and the English 'aesthetes' are passed over as 'impure' on grounds of doubtful consistency. It is noticeable that those poets who have seemed most interesting to the world at large incur the gravest suspicions of heresy. Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Shelley, Baudelaire, all have their slips. Rimbaud, on the other hand, was 'an uncompromising aesthetic purist'; he not only 'had nothing to teach' but also 'had nothing to convey'. If that is really true, why is it so mysterious to Dr van der Vat that the poet gave up writing altogether at the age of 19? In general we have here a useful anthology of aesthetic theories of a type which we already knew to be very common in the nineteenth century, and should like very much to know more about them. What were their origins? what their relation to German aesthetics? Is not Coleridge's theory of the imagination indirectly very important in many of these theorists? What of the spread of French critical theories in late nineteenth-century England? Are any consequences in poetry itself to be traced to the conscious holding of such theories? Links between the French symbolists and English romanticism are suggested, and indications of the debt of Baudelaire to Poe, of Yeats to Blake, do something to draw the evidence into continuity, but the book lacks historical organization. It is not really a 'study of continuity' but an assembly of convergent theories. As such it may be useful to students of nineteenth-century poetry. It has not been given to all of us to know what art is, even less what it ought to be; nevertheless it is interesting to know what these celebrated artists thought about it. And

we may shelter our own uncertainty behind the substantial figure of Sainte-Beuve, who, according to the author, 'was not quite clear about it all'.

MANCHESTER.

ROSS D. WALLER.

Primitivism and Decadence. A study of American Experimental Poetry.

BY YVOR WINTERS. New York: Arrow Editions. 1937. xiii + 146 pp. \$2.50.

'This kind of writing is not "a new kind of poetry". It is the old poetry with half the meaning removed... Genius has been expended on it, but its nature should be recognized.' This sums up the conclusions and the method of this very careful and revealing study of some modern American poets—notably Eliot and Pound, Hart Crane, William Carlos Williams and Wallace Stevens.

Yvor Winters argues cogently for an ideal of poetry as 'a technique of contemplation and comprehension'. He regards the perfect poem as a complete act of the spirit, calling upon the full life of the spirit in both writer and reader, and he sees these contemporary poets as limiting and weakening their art by a deliberate exclusion of an essential part of that spirit. This essential part is the faculty of intellectual coherence and structure, of logic and precision of thought. 'To say that a poet is justified in employing a disintegrated form in order to express a feeling of disintegration is merely a sophistical justification of bad poetry... and in so far as any poetry tends towards the formless, it fails to be expressive of anything.' The argument is sustained by a detailed and very stimulating analysis of the uses and abuses of language as the poetic medium in the present and in the past, and of the wide implications towards the whole of life involved in questions of literary discipline.

Yvor Winters's final conclusions are common to many readers and lovers of poetry to-day, who combine a vague dissatisfaction with the obscurity and monotony of modern poetry with a real, if grudging admiration for its technical skill; but it is unusual and agreeable to find these conclusions arrived at, and supported by, so keen a mind and spirit.

ELIZABETH DREW.

CAMBRIDGE.

Geschichte der Mittelfranzösischen Literatur. II. Vers- und Prosadichtung des 15. Jahrhunderts. By GUSTAV GRÖBER. Zweite Auflage. Bearbeitet von STEFAN HOFER. (*Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, 4/2.) Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter. 1937. 313 pp. RM. 14.

The contents of Dr Hofer's second volume correspond roughly to those of Gröber's fifth 'Zeitabschnitt, B, I-II' (*Grundriss*, II (i), pp. 1090-1159). As in the first volume, the sections have been reshuffled, but less successfully. The only princely courts to which separate chapters have been devoted are those of Charles d'Orléans (56-73) and the dukes of Burgundy (180-220). The rest of the matter is treated sometimes under the headings of 'authors' (Christine de Pisan, Villon, Baude, Coquillart),

sometimes of 'subjects' (Die Nachahmungen der Belle Dame sans Merci, Puis, Das Lied, Didaktik und Moral in Versen, etc.), which means that some, but not all (Der Prosaroman, Die Novelle), of these headings are treated again in connexion with the court of Burgundy. Most of the text has been re-composed, though some discrepancies remain (Jean Milet's *Forest de Tristesse*, p. 71, is surely the same work as the anonymous *Procès* mentioned on p. 120). There is a final chapter, 'Der Humanismus in Frankreich' (228-40), which has no counterpart in Gröber.

The Bibliography, which is almost complete, mentions books and articles published as late as June 1936. On pp. 288-91 there is an additional bibliography to Vol. I. There is, however, one important omission; no reference is made to the indispensable *Introduction et Notes to the Jardin de Plaisance* published by M. A. Piaget and Mlle E. Droz (Société des Anciens Textes Français) in 1924. The *Jardin de Plaisance* itself, often mentioned in the text, is not mentioned in the Index.

New converts to the study of fifteenth-century literature ought perhaps to be warned that the proper names are not always perfectly recorded (Martin de France for Martin Le Franc, Pierre Michaud for Pierre Michault, Anne de Chaumeigny for Anne de Chauvigny, etc.) and that dates are sometimes wrong (p. 192, 1564 for 1464), so a careful check must be made of details given in this important work of reference.

Dr Hofer's two volumes are a timely contribution to the study of French literature in the fifteenth century, a kind of 'Etat présent des études...', showing both what has been done and, what is even more important, what there remains to do in order to perfect our knowledge of the period.

THOMAS WALTON.

BIRMINGHAM.

Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrétiens von Troyes im Perceval-roman. By WILHELM KELLERMANN. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1936. 232 pp. RM. 12.

This is an interesting study of Chrétien's *Perceval* (the 9234 lines of Hilka's edition) considered in respect of its construction and of the *Weltbild*, the system of social, ethical and religious values which it embodies. There are obvious objections to studying these aspects of an unfinished work, one, moreover, in which Chrétien's share has been variously assessed; but Herr Kellermann meets them on the whole convincingly. Comparing the *Perceval* fragment with Chrétien's previous romances, *Erec*, *Cligès* and *Yvain*, he shows it to be built up, like them, in two sections, united by a central scene at Arthur's court. This comparison shows further that the thesis set forth in the fragment can be viewed as a whole when regarded as complementary to the earlier works.

Herr Kellermann emphatically denies that *Perceval* is formless, and highly praises Chrétien's mastery of his heterogeneous material. The Gauvain episodes, he considers, bear Chrétien's characteristic stamp and are an integral part of the romance, which he divides into two sections thus: the development of Perceval from simple boy to admired knight

and the contrasted adventures of Gauvain and Perceval, the model of secular chivalry and the knight whose chivalry is sanctified by religious experience.

To Herr Kellermann Chrétien is much more than a mere story-teller. While carefully distinguishing Chrétien's view of the Grail story from the mystical interpretations of Robert de Boron and later writers, he sees the true subject of *Perceval* to be a moral problem, the expiation of a sin against the ultimate ethical standards set up for the laity by the medieval Church. He illuminates Chrétien's attitude to this problem by reference to Wolfram von Eschenbach's *Parzival*, whose questionings of God's ways have a tragic interest not found in *Perceval*'s straightforward recognition of his guilt. Comparison with *Parzival* and the French Grail romances shows how Chrétien's treatment of his theme remains throughout objective and epic, eschewing didacticism and personal reflections. But, though apparently detached, Chrétien is not superficial.

The last chapter deals with the sources of the Grail legend as Chrétien tells it, attacking this vexed question with admirable caution, from the angle of a comparison with Robert de Boron's *Estoire dou Graal*. The detailed arguments cannot be summarized here: they lead to the conclusion that the *livre* given to Chrétien by his patron did not present the Grail as the receptacle of the Holy Blood confided to Joseph of Arimathea, nor did it mention the Fisher King or the bleeding lance. It probably contained the idea of an initiation to be undergone by the guardian of the Grail, and this may have led Chrétien to combine the Grail legend with the folk-tale motive of the question to be asked by the hero.

The book contains much significant detail, to which a short review cannot do justice. Of particular interest are the discussion of the motives of Chrétien's characters and the classification of his ethical values in terms of the contemporary *philosophia moralis*. It presents a thorough exposition of Chrétien's methods. It is questionable how far these methods can be regarded as peculiar to an individual author in an age in which literary technique was so conventional, but Herr Kellermann endeavours to counter this objection. His book not only contributes to the understanding of *Perceval* and of its place in Chrétien's work as a whole, but, by its frequent reference to M.H.G. romances, offers material towards a comparative study of national psychology which might profitably be carried further.

CLAUDINE I. WILSON.

LONDON.

The Political Doctrine of Montesquieu's 'Esprit des Lois': Its Classical Background. By LAWRENCE M. LEVIN, Ph.D. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, Columbia University. 1936. xii + 359 pp.

Dr Levin is certainly to be congratulated on his prowess as a sleuth, for he has tracked down with aquiline eye every classical text which

might be suspected of complicity in the formation of Montesquieu's political views. He disarms criticism, however, by taking cover behind a vague title, and by insisting at the outset that he 'presents significant parallels rather than definite sources'. His intention is 'to determine to what an extent Montesquieu's political ideas... followed the route that had been blazed by the ancients' (p. 25). In short, his thesis offers no thesis; it sets out to prove nothing in particular; lacking any didactic purpose, it becomes little more than an assemblage—though a very complete and scholarly one—of those *lieux communs* of ancient political theory and practice which reappear in the *Esprit des Lois*.

Dr Levin's method is first to eliminate from what he calls the '*rudis indigestaque moles*' that is the *Esprit*' a great amount of unessential material, and then to rearrange what remains in the interests of clarity. Such simplification is perfectly legitimate in view of the demonstration he proposes, but hardly justifies him in applying unkind names to a work which, as its author rightly claimed, is a closely knit unit when looked at as a whole. Moreover, it was almost inevitable that in the process of displaying his simplified Montesquieu against a mosaic of classical analogues, Dr Levin should produce a *moles* even more undigested than the *Esprit des Lois*. This was hardly Dr Levin's fault; it was inherent in the task he had set himself.

The principal fact which emerges from this study is that Montesquieu's way with the classics was the same as that of Boileau with Aristotle and Horace: he was inclined to seize upon some casual observation of theirs concerning legal or political practice, the influence of climate, etc., and to erect it into a law. This is particularly the case with the various *principes* which he assigns to his four types of government. Both Plato in his *Republic* and Aristotle in his *Politics* had vaguely remarked that according as societies were governed in different ways they tended to exhibit certain distinctive moral characteristics; but neither had suggested that such characteristics were either essential or general. Montesquieu's scheme of *principes* had indeed many sources, including classical ones, but in the dogmatic form in which it appears in his book it is quite original. Dr Levin freely acknowledges this, but seems to think that this modicum of 'artificial and arbitrary' originality scarcely justifies Montesquieu's proud boast that his work was *prolem sine matre creatam*. In reality, Montesquieu's originality consisted far less in creating new ideas than in imposing upon old fact (and old fiction, if need were) a new order which rendered it dynamic and fruitful. And Dr Levin's thesis is chiefly valuable in that it reveals in Montesquieu a supreme example of those latter-day, synthetic geniuses of whom Sainte-Beuve wrote: 'Ces génies abondants, qui ne sont pourtant plus les divins vieillards et les aveugles fabuleux, lisent, comparent, imitent, comme tous ceux de leur âge; cela ne les empêche pas de créer, comme aux âges naissants.'

F. T. H. FLETCHER.

LIVERPOOL.

Einleitung in die Encyclopédie der französischen Aufklärung. By FRITZ SCHALK. (*Münchener Romanistische Arbeiten*, Heft vi.) Munich: Max Hueber. 1936. 152 pp. 6 M. 40.

This is a sombre study of failure. The French Enlightenment had generous aims: social betterment and increase of human happiness. Did it bring much of either to its own generation, the France of 1789, the Europe of 1848, the world of 1937? Herr Schalk has his doubts. But the main subject of his philosophic and pessimistic analysis is the *Encyclopédie* and it at least was an undoubted failure. It was foredoomed, he finds, by two inherent and fatal discrepancies: one between the idea of Encyclopaedia and that of Writer, as it was understood in France c. 1750; the other, between two or more conceptions of what this particular encyclopaedia should be.

During the first half of the eighteenth century, for historical reasons, which he fully sets forth, French writers acquired not only social standing, but professional status. They were content to be what they were, namely writers—asking nothing from the Church, with which they were out of sympathy, and nothing from the Universities, which in France were the last refuge of scholasticism and without influence on the cultured world. The social ideal became no longer 'l'honnête homme', but 'l'homme universel', and his instruction was provided for by the universal writer—one in whose nature it was (nature, not pose, not economic necessity) to be a publicist, jurist, scientist, historian, philosopher, stylist and even (in the eighteenth century conception of the term) a poet. From this little world of writers arose the *Encyclopédie*, 'rédigée par une société de gens de lettres'.

There was much discussion as to what the projected work ought to be. Merely informative, like Moréri or Chambers? Critical, doubt-raising, destructive, like Bayle? Instructive, but with some discreet 'philosophic' propaganda?—The Editors decided to follow the lines laid down by Bacon, whom a prospective contributor (Voltaire) had recently 'discovered'. The work would be both (a) 'encyclopédie' and (b) 'dictionnaire'; it would (a) offer a classification of all human knowledge and have philosophical import, and (b) give the content of all Sciences and serve a practical purpose, popularization. Its ultimate aim would be to turn knowledge to the service of 'le bien public'.

The *Encyclopédie*, thus, had many missions, including a social one, and they were all to be accomplished by the recognized means, by 'l'éloquence'—by 'writing', in the full, artistic, emotional sense. But when the volumes began to appear, from 1751, the contributors were dismayed to find they had been working at cross-purposes. They were in agreement as publicists, but not as writers. Those who could write, e.g. the leaders of the enterprise, felt ashamed of those who could not, the rank and file of *abbés*, *notaires*, financiers, technicians, scientific or other experts. The publication itself seemed here a Dictionary of Science, there a Popular Educator, now an innocuous Bayle, now an inaccurate Chambers, sometimes 'Baconian' and sometimes not. Disappointment, and criticism,

spread, and in 1757 Voltaire ceased to contribute, D'Alembert resigned, and Diderot was left in sole charge.

But Diderot remained what he had always been, the very incarnation of the fatal antithesis, for in his celebrated 'tête encyclopédique', and in his whole life, public and private, a tumultuous struggle proceeded, *dubio Marte*, between the Born Encyclopaedist and the Born Writer. He was interested in all knowledge. But his natural modes of expression were literary forms: the Soliloquy, Colloquy, Dialogue, Letter, etc. His models were literary—and unsuitable: the unmethodical Montaigne; the moralist La Bruyère; Richardson, much admired because he writes 'sans liaison, dessin, ordre' and mixes sentiment with business. Diderot felt with ever increasing bitterness that he was tied up in a gigantic undertaking which was corporate, impersonal and scientific, whereas his true vocation was self-expression in literature. Before the end, he lost his belief in the whole enterprise. But long before him his brother-*philosophes* had lost theirs. They had perceived that *vulgarization* of knowledge has a double sense. What was good for genuine *philosophes* seemed to them bad for semi-educated experts, whose vulgarity gained prominence in the *Encyclopédie* and was imitated by the unlearned who, all over France, were pursuing self-instruction in its miscellaneous pages. In short, the Enlightenment, from its very beginnings, suffered from self-criticism and lack of faith. The pessimism of the enlightened after 1789 was no new thing.

Herr Schalk's views seem to us sound and valuable. They have, however, the defects of their philosophic qualities, and they suffer from the imprecision characteristic of so many eighteenth-century studies. No 'century' is more clearly laid out. No 'watershed' is more real (as he says, p. 10) than the middle of the eighteenth century—to be quite precise, as we have shown elsewhere, 1749. Yet his *dramatis personae* appear indifferently, and without comment, now on one side of the watershed, now on the other. It is seldom clear whether his Voltaire is the venerable Sage of Ferney or the writer who in 1749 had, though well over fifty, hardly begun to be 'Voltairean'. Nor is it clearer what manner, and what extent, of collaboration in the *Encyclopédie* could be expected in 1749 from Montesquieu who had shot his bolt, and from Diderot who, with one notorious exception, had not then published a book which was not a (somewhat feeble) translation from English. Herr Schalk quotes with melancholy approval various depressed utterances by *philosophes*. But their significance depends entirely on dates and circumstances and these usually remain vague. Grimm's Jeremiads last for fifty years and some of them are *post-* and *propter*-Revolution. No doubt, in correspondence often undated, Diderot makes an occasional despairing remark about his *Encyclopédie*. But is this always a considered opinion, or sometimes one prompted by vinous or other momentary depression? Frederick the Great condemns the *Encyclopédie*—and also the whole eighteenth century lock, stock and barrel—and states that his literary approbation went long since, once and for all, to the seventeenth. His letter (2 July 1769) proves *far* too much.

The Pissgah view is not without its optical illusions. At closer quarters many of the reasons why the *Encyclopédie* failed are not at all philosophic and general, but purely personal. It had been in progress for years when D'Alembert formulated its Baconian principles, *après coup*. It not only originated with a translation of Chambers made by 'deux aventuriers'—a strange name for a Professor of Göttingen and the subject of a long article in the *D.N.B.*—but to the very end it incorporated Chambers, faithfully and unblushingly. It was a business undertaking. The Editors were unbusinesslike—genuinely surprised, for example, to see in print what one or other had passed in MS. In the later stages an alumnus of Cambridge, the Chevalier de Jaucourt, concocted many of the articles, and Diderot, in such time as he could spare from Sophie Volland, touched them off with an unhelpful peroration and a splutter of exclamation marks.

As for internal defects, weakness of plan, inequalities of tone in the articles, inappropriateness of 'artistic' writing, etc.—such things are not fatal. Dr Johnson has irrelevances; there is occasional humour in Liddell and/or Scott; Littré had ideas on other subjects than lexicography; there may be 'art' in encyclopaedia-making, as in anything else. As for 'self-criticism', high hopes certainly were entertained, c. 1750, by some *philosophes*; Grimm and others kept their heads. Voltaire, c. 1757, thought that he could make a brighter 'Dictionnaire' of his own—which was quite true. Quâ encyclopaedia, the work of which so much was hoped was a failure, partly because of 'temperamental' editing. As a *machine de guerre* it was a startling success, partly for the same reason.

R. L. G. RITCHIE.

BIRMINGHAM.

Ultra-Royalism and the French Restoration. By NORAH E. HUDSON. Cambridge University Press. 1936. xiii+209 pp. 10s. 6d.

Here is a book which will interest chiefly students of the history of Parliamentary government in France. 'The early years of the Restoration were the golden age of political doctrines, but from the practical standpoint there were but two problems to be solved, the division of power between King and Chamber, the division of influence between aristocracy and bourgeoisie' (p. 196). Miss Hudson, isolating this aspect of Restoration history, after giving, in her first chapter, a very brief outline of royalist political theory—that of J. de Maistre, de Bonald, Chateaubriand, and Fiévée, shows how the two last legitimist Bourbons, with their more or less moderate ministries, failed to solve these problems and so paved the way, not so much for the reign of the bourgeoisie, as for the social and economic conflicts of the July Monarchy.

Once embarked, Miss Hudson deals competently and clearly with the endless shiftings of parties and the bewildering game of political chess which made of Ultras and Liberals in turn, according to the inspirations of the moment, supporters or antagonists of 'gouvernement selon la Charte'. Her concluding survey of the period and its significance is sound

and interesting. Her book goes a long way towards making clear the falsity of the old tag that the restored Bourbons 'forgot nothing and learnt nothing', and explains adequately why imported English constitutionalism, imperfectly understood, could not succeed in the formidable task it was expected to accomplish from 1815 to 1830. The conclusions thus reached justify her isolation of the purely parliamentary aspect of Restoration history.

Her Introduction and first chapter seem to me weak. The object of the former is apparently to explain why political conservatism and literary revolutionism go hand in hand during the Restoration period. Miss Hudson seems ill at ease or imperfectly informed when dealing with literary history or abstract politics. Her early Romantics are too anonymous for the general statements she makes about them to be acceptable. She is too ready, for example, to classify the literary religiosity of the Revolutionary and Imperial periods as Catholic, a heading under which it would be bold to include such diversely inspired writers as Chateaubriand, Mme de Staël, Mme de Krüdener, Constant, Senancour, Nodier, etc. And is the Vigny even of the 'twenties a 'catholic poet *par excellence*'? With regard to the late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century return to religion, does she know of the works of M. Seillière, and M. Viatte's *Sources Occultes*? She would find here a more complete explanation of pre-Romantic and early Romantic religious and catholicizing tendencies than the usual one of Emigrant tribulations. In fact in analysing these tendencies it was imperative to take into account the influence from 1770 of quietists, illuminists and theosophists, whose fascination few writers escaped at some moment in their career. The author scarcely mentions illuminism except to give a ludicrous definition of it in a footnote to p. 36.

A similar weakness mars her first chapter in so far as it refers to eighteenth-century political theory. Without absolutely violating the thought of Montesquieu and Rousseau, she alludes to it in broad and anachronistic terms calculated to make a student of these two thinkers bristle, as on pp. 18 and 20 where she assigns to them the doctrine of the 'rights of man'. Neither *L'Esprit des Lois* nor *Le Contrat Social* will really bear such a boiling-down. 'The individual was subordinated to society, and his claims to those of the community' (p. 20) applies as aptly to the latter work as to Bossuet.

These objections, however, only apply to Miss Hudson's preliminary canters. Further details: misprints p. 23 (*virtu*) and p. 32 (*telle quelle est*); p. 17: Martines de Pasqually was almost certainly not a Jew.

OXFORD.

H. J. HUNT.

Histoire de la Poésie Française, t. x, *André Chénier*. By ÉMILE FAGUET. Paris: Boivin. 1936. 320 pp. 15 fr.

These lectures on André Chénier rather than on his poetry were given in 1902. It is but normal, after one-third of a century has elapsed, that the informative part dealing with the material that life and literature offered

this poet should be superseded by M. Dimoff's fully documented account in two recently published volumes. The rest—the attempt to cope with Chénier's creative genius—hardly claimed to supersede Sainte-Beuve's three short essays. Indeed, full assent is expressed at the end of chapter vi with Sainte-Beuve's summing-up: in form, an *Alexandrin*; in subject-matter, a man of the eighteenth century. Afterwards, it is true, in chapter ix, this old distinction between form and matter is rejected as obsolete (in a sentence so hastily put together that *l'envers* and *la douleur* are reckoned as more or less the same thing, thereby damaging a simile). But the attitude of mind it betokened remains, and the feeling is never very far away that the business in hand is to 'place' Chénier, to make him a term in a poetic series. It is significant, for instance, that the melancholy of his *invocation à Versailles* is to be prized, *because* it links him up with a later school of poetry.

Whatever excellent reasons there may have been for publishing an unrevised text, the result is somewhat depressing. Casual assertions which no doubt might pass muster in oral delivery, give the effect, in print, of slap-dash comment obscuring the genial shrewdness and sense of humour more conspicuous in the same writer's other books. Had Faguet revised this book for the press, would he have allowed those dates on p. 13 to stand, crediting Louis Chénier with almost miraculous foresight? Would he, in cold blood, have retained the term *sensiblerie* applied to Malherbe's *Stances à du Périer*, that most stately of consolations? (p. 208). Or still seriously maintained (p. 141) that a poet who was also a moralist in his strangely restricted sense of the word, i.e., who could throw off brief highly polished character-sketches, was practically unique? (p. 129). Would p. 106 have been left as it is, suggesting, though it does not say, that the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries produced no scholars to attempt the critical study of ancient texts? Faguet cannot have shared the naïve notion that, until the eighteenth century, no serious effort was made to understand 'the real meaning' of the Bible. He *cannot* have believed a well-known line from Racine's *Phèdre* to be Chénier's. Yet pages 128-9 and 263 read just as though he had.

H. BIBAS.

CAMBRIDGE.

Jules Sandeau: l'Homme et la Vie. By MABEL SILVER. Paris: Boivin et Cie. 1937. 247 pp. with engravings. 35 fr.

By this well-documented biography Mrs Silver has added a useful and very readable chapter to French literary history in the nineteenth century. Jules Sandeau is one of those second-rate writers whom no resuscitation or boosting can push into the first rank, and his biographer, who combines sobriety of judgment with good sense, has made no attempt to do so. 'Plus qu'une étude de ses œuvres, on trouvera donc ici une biographie, une psychologie'; one moreover which avoids the sensational and the scandalous, that never-failing resource of the modern researcher. Not that Sandeau's career would easily lend itself to such treatment. It is that of an average Jeune-France of 1830 who, like

Jérôme Paturot, soon discovers how intensively uncomfortable stormy passions can be, and who, early converted to 'middle-class morality', is lucky enough to find a wife who not only restores his sense of proportion but even helps him to conquer his constitutional laziness. Under her influence he becomes a champion of the 'Bon-Sens' school, and in the Second Empire reaps his reward in the shape of official favours, subsidies and sinecures, together with a seat in the Academy. Flaubert, as a friend and correspondent of Pauline Sandeau, must have muttered, *sotto voce*, many an ironic comment on such services rendered to art!

The impression of Sandeau's character as given by Mrs Silver's narrative (unintentionally, I think) is not altogether pleasing. He emerges as a vain, if not foppish (see, p. 92, the alleged portrait of himself from *Marianna*), egoistical and self-centred young man. It is by no means easy to see in him an entirely innocent victim of 'la femme à l'œil sombre'; and, if he was, he completely revenged himself on the sex by his treatment of Marie Dorval. The story of his literary collaborations, after the break with George Sand, shows him as an embarrassed, lackadaisical and possibly ungrateful protégé of the no doubt exacting Balzac; while his author's vanity, once dramatic success was reached, prompted a very ungracious attitude to the actor Regnier who really 'made' *Mlle de la Seiglière*. Yet the history of his relations with the great writers of the time—Sand, Balzac, and afterwards Émile Augier—constitutes the chief interest of Mrs Silver's biography: he basks in their limelight.

His work itself, as seen in the book, affords several points of interest. It illustrates well the gradual evolution, from its beginnings under Louis-Philippe, of what Laprade was to call the 'Muses d'État', and especially that of the *comédie de mœurs*—Sandeau deserves his niche in literary history, if for nothing else, at any rate for having made *le Gendre de M. Poirier* possible. Also Mrs Silver's illustrations of Sandeau's meticulous care in composition suggest a curious contrast with Flaubert: in the case of the novelist of genius, laborious composition was the necessary condition of artistic greatness, whereas with the inferior workman it led only to preciousness and over-elaboration of metaphor.

The book is well printed (I noticed only one misprint: 'énamouré' on p. 105), on good paper, and provided with twelve interesting engravings, an ample bibliography and index.

H. J. HUNT.

OXFORD.

Il Convivio ridotto a miglior lezione e commentato. By G. BUSNELLI and G. VANDELLI, with an introduction by M. Barbi (*Opere di Dante*, vols. iv and v). Florence: Le Monnier. Vol. I (1934), vol. II (1937): lxxviii + 486; 465 pp. respectively. 120 lire.

This is not fare suited for weak and capricious stomachs; it is a massive piece of work, presenting for the first time an important medieval treatise by Dante with an adequate commentary: and its publication is of good omen for all students of Dante. Considering the immense output of

Dantean literature during the last hundred years, it seems strange to aver that the *Rime*, the *De Vulgari* and the *Monarchia*, no less than the *Convivio*, have hitherto lacked a scholarly presentation; there have been attempts; most aspects of each work have been considered in detail by different scholars, but scholars seem to have been frightened by the extent and diversity of the material which they were expected to sift, and by the general preparation that such an edition must demand of them. It is half a century since the Società Dantesca undertook the task of preparing a fully annotated critical edition of Dante's works: at long intervals the late Pio Rajna, and that tireless scholar Michele Barbi, produced the volumes containing the *De Vulgari* and the *Vita Nuova* (this latter work was reissued in a revised edition in 1932). But the small band of scholars who were originally entrusted with the labour was gradually thinned out by death (Parodi, Rajna, Novati, and now Vandelli have been taken) and distracted from their task by other duties; on the occasion of the centenary celebrations in 1921, by a great effort, a bare if invaluable critical text of all the works in one volume was provided. By then, the main driving force appeared to be Barbi; in the face of the impact of political events and of much loose talk partly justified by the sweeping statements of Croce, Barbi kept firmly to his task, provided with his *Studi Danteschi* a necessary substitute for the *Bollettino della Società Dantesca*, and finally, when he was forced to realize that under present conditions the fulfilment of the original promise had become impossible, he planned a new edition which, in his all too modest words, aims no longer at providing a definitive edition, but an edition embodying the results of the unremitting labours of two generations of Dantists. Considering that the discovery of new manuscripts is by now unlikely, and that there is scarcely a point in Dantean criticism that has not been discussed, it is easy to realize that this edition must furnish a text which leaves little, if any, room for improvement, and, what is more, an authoritatively sifted conspectus of the interpretative labours of all these years which, if not definitive in result, must be the basis of any future advance.

These two volumes fully justify the modest promises of Barbi, and indeed satisfy the highest expectations that scholars may have entertained. The *Convivio*, perhaps more than any other of Dante's works, required a multiplicity of gifts and information that no one scholar may be expected to possess. Parodi had already shown in 1921 the almost irremediable inadequacy of the textual tradition; all extant manuscripts seem to depend on an archetype that was already defective and probably suffered also from dialectal alterations. Conjectural emendations were unavoidable, but they could only be attempted by paying full attention to Dante's probable sources as well as to the usual dictates of textual criticism. Parodi's ingenuity, he was then assisted by Pellegrini, had already succeeded in 1921 in tracing most defective passages, and often in suggesting reasonable emendations for the omissions; but now a truly remarkable progress has been made. The acute eye of Vandelli has had the assistance not only of Barbi, whose flair and ingenuity are almost

uncanny, but the constant and invaluable help of the Rev. Busnelli, whose learning in medieval philosophy and whose familiarity with the works of Aquinas and his sources can scarcely be paralleled in modern days. Dante scholarship was already under a great debt to him for a number of important contributions, and he has now provided a philosophic commentary that cannot but be of lasting value.

No reader of the *Commedia* can overlook that Dante's mind was occupied with the *Convivio* and the *De Vulgari* until the urge of composing the great poem became overwhelming; he was trying his hand for the first time at a work in which his philosophic learning would have full scope, and he was conscious of fashioning a new medium of philosophic expression by his use of the vernacular. When he realized the ripeness of his thought, as well as the worthiness of this medium which he cherished with the love of a father and of a son at the same time, he finally undertook the writing of the *Commedia*. But no reader who wishes to understand the growth of the *Commedia* can afford to disregard the *Convivio*, and it has only been through shortsightedness and inadequacy of preparation that the *Convivio* has been dubbed a failure. It is a difficult work, for it is saturated with medieval thought, but it has been hitherto immensely more difficult to understand because of the lack of adequate notes. Therefore the publication of Busnelli's commentary may be considered in a way to open out a new era in Dante studies, for few readers, and even few so-called Dantists, have been competent to peruse the *Convivio* unassisted by a commentary. Obviously not every emendation will necessarily be accepted by all, and Bruno Nardi has already shown his dissent from certain readings and interpretations (cf. *Studi Danteschi*, 1937, xx, 27-39), nor will all Busnelli's notes be taken as definitive. But there is here provided a conspectus of all previous researches that may furnish a starting point for a better informed critical appreciation of the *Convivio*. It would be impossible to give a full illustration of the merits of this edition within a limited space; an example, and by no means the most significant and important, must suffice. In *Conv.* I, vii, 9 the *Testo Critico* read 'e l' uomo è obediante a la giustizia [quando fa quello, e non più né meno, che la giustizia] comanda', the words between brackets being supplied as a conjectural integration; but 'fa quello' seemed inadequate, and the present editors after comparing several passages of Aquinas (*Contra Gent.* I. 3, c. 146; *Comm. Ethic.* I. 5, lects. 5-6 and lect. 16) found in the last of them the words: 'Et ideo epiiches non plus apponit de poena quam sufficiat ad cohibenda peccata', by which they have felt justified in completing the text thus: 'a la giustizia [quando fa *pagar lo debito de la pena*, e non più né meno che la giustizia]', which is obviously better in style as well as more probably right. And any page would provide similar examples, even apart from the appendices that follow each treatise, and where the more complex problems are extensively dealt with. It would be superfluous to give praise to the lucid and exhaustive introduction of Barbi, but praise must be given to the indices, the first of which (*Indice sommario*) provides a full record of the subjects dealt with in each chapter, while the second

(*Indice analítico*) contains references to proper names and to all the principal subjects upon which Dante has touched.

The appearance of the *De vulgari eloquentia* edited by Aristide Marigo, that is announced as imminent, will be most welcome.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

La Crónica de Veinte Reyes. By THEODORE BABBITT. (Yale Romanic Studies, XIII) Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 1936. viii+172 pp. 11s. 6d.

Apart from the *Primera Crónica General* there are two texts which enter into all discussions of Spanish heroic matter, viz. the *Segunda Crónica General* (1344) and the *Crónica de Veinte Reyes*. Until these are published opinion on the *cantares* will remain conjectural and second-hand; but Mr Babbitt informs us that questions of cost preclude an edition of the *Veinte Reyes*. Lacking an edition, we must do what we can with extracts and a careful analysis such as this work affords. The problem posed is that of the relative age of the *Veinte Reyes* and the *Primera General*. The former does not occur in manuscripts before the fourteenth century, but shows some remarkable archaisms which have been explained as a reversion to primitive sources. Mr Babbitt's solution is to reckon the *Veinte Reyes* as a composite document, part of which is older than the *Primera General*. The whole history of Spain was divided into two parts by the Moorish invasion, and the second of these tended to be divided into four divisions: (1) to the death of Ordoño II, (2) to the death of Bermudo III the last king of León, (3) to the death of Alfonso VI, (4) to that of Fernando III. Six out of nine manuscripts of this chronicle bear the title *Crónica de Once Reyes*, and this might be contrived to cover the kings from Fruela II to Alfonso VI included in the second and third divisions of the above scheme, or by another reckoning it might include only the kings as far as Bermudo III. In either case the suggestion is that the *Once Reyes* are an old nucleus, part of the Alfonsine scheme of Spanish history, and that the remaining kings have been added later. Mr Babbitt's opinion is that the oldest section extends from Fruela II to Bermudo III, and that this was extended to cover three more reigns (to Alfonso VI) in the thirteenth century, before the emergence of the *Primera General* (1289). After the *Primera General* there occurred an extension from Alfonso VII to Alfonso VIII which draws freely on un-historical sources, together with an entirely independent account of Alfonso IX of León inserted as a complete *corpus*. The *Veinte Reyes* was then rounded off by directly copying the *Primera General* for the history of Fernando III. The transitions are marked for Mr Babbitt by abrupt changes ('From the accession of Alfonso VII, the foregoing relations between the chronicles change somewhat abruptly'... 'From the accession of Fernando III the *CVR* again changes completely in style,' pp. 158, 160). The reader, however, who has not the advantage of comparing two texts, must endeavour to build up an opinion on a number of reported details which are not always striking or conclusive.

The method of proof employed is the comparison of the two chronicles with their known sources. But in matters of detail these are most imperfectly known. For Lucas Tudensis and Rodericus Toletanus we have only the edition of Schottus, which ought to be replaced by something more reassuring to modern criticism. Readers of the *Primera General* are familiar with passages in which Don Lucas and Don Rodrigo are made to say things which in the accessible Latin text they do not say. The Latin texts were translated into Spanish in the thirteenth century, but it would appear that the early Castilian versions throw no light on the problem before us. That of Lucas published by Puyol, which I have compared at a number of points, is definitely irrelevant. For the two chronicles Mr Babbitt holds that 'the principal source is some compilation of Rodrigo and Lucas'—naturally one lost to science. But, at certain points, 'the two chronicles appear to be based on different versions of the compilation of Rodrigo and Lucas', as when *Veinte Reyes* uses more Lucas and *Primera General* more Rodrigo. Even the *Primera General*, though printed by Menéndez Pidal, is a somewhat uncertain quantity, since, in relation to its sources, we must not think of the polished palace text but of the unedited *redacción vulgar*. While the 'compilation of Lucas and Rodrigo' appears to have been prepared in the vulgar tongue, there are passages where 'either the compilers of the two chronicles were working directly off the Latin text, or, which seems more probable, that there were in existence two translations of the *Historia Arabum*, with similar chapter-division' (p. 36). There are specifically Latin blunders, like *CVR: de so si* from *et socii*, and in both chronicles *fuera a Citana* for *a Citana venerant*. The criteria adopted by the chroniclers varied from time to time, according as sometimes the historical, sometimes the epic, sources seemed good in their eyes, and sometimes Lucas, sometimes Rodericus.

All these uncertainties are familiar to Mr Babbitt who does not seek to disguise them. His exposition is full of 'may be', 'seems', 'apparently', 'either...or'. In spite of, or because of, that, he has done a most valuable piece of work, for he has shaken orthodoxy on an important point and he has put forward a quite plausible alternative. Either the *Veinte Reyes* seems older in certain parts because it is older than the royal chronicle, or because it made use of older sources. Its critical importance for the text of the *Cid* and other poems is unaffected, and indeed confirmed by a fresh opinion. Apart from that, we who are not in a position to confront the two texts have been duly warned not to allow our ignorance to crystallize into dogma.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Autógrafos de LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO. (*El Cordobés Valeroso Pedro Carbonero*, 1603, ed. MARION A. ZEITLIN; *La Prueba de los Amigos*, 1604, ed. LESLEY BYRD SIMPSON; *La Batalla del Honor*, 1608, ed. ROBERT K. SPAULDING; *El Bastardo Mudarra*, 1612, ed. S. GRISWOLD MORLEY; *El Desden Vengado*, 1617, ed. IRVING A. LEONARD.) Berkeley: California University Press; Cambridge: University Press. 1934-5. 5s. 6d. each.

Though it is customary to lament the textual inadequacy of classical Spanish comedias, it is none the less certain that the tradition of Lope de Vega's plays is much sounder than that of his contemporary Shakespeare. Apart from the *Partes* issued during the poet's lifetime, either under his own authority or at least under the correction of contemporary opinion, there are thirteen or fourteen autograph plays, constituting in themselves a respectable theatre. The University of California has undertaken the task of presenting them to the world, reproducing not merely the texts but also the erasures and cancelled lines, which are often of considerable interest. The printing is clear, though in three of these volumes the ends of hendecasyllables have been forced to spill over into a second line. The limp cloth covers tend to curl in the hand and fray at the angles. A facsimile is provided of the first and last pages of the manuscripts, showing the signatures and dates, together with other devices used by Lope de Vega, and the annotations of the censors. The autographs contain also the names of the original cast for each play, with some cancellations, and these indications are given for each act separately. The reproduction of the texts I believe to be quite accurate, though there is a wrong division of lines in *Batalla del Honor* 2546-7, and 1191 should have been attributed to 'ARN.'

The precise dates attached to these pieces should be of great service in estimating the development of Lope's genius. On this subject much confusion has reigned, nor has it been entirely removed by A. Hämel's essay. It has been so difficult to arrange any considerable number of plays in chronological order without peradventure, that many critics have preferred to keep to the more obvious classification by subject, ignoring the time factor. One could not, in any case, base inferences on the details of the printed texts, since these might prove to be erroneous. The autographs are, however, texts worthy of all faith, capable of bearing the weight of any inference. Those under consideration range from 1603 to 1617, and they are most instructive. *El Cordobés Valeroso* belongs to the romantic manner of Lope's *Remedio de la Desdicha*, valiant Abencerrajes and still more valiant Christians, little psychology or dramatic economy, an exuberant style. The *gracioso* Hamete, when contrasted with Tomín in *El Desden Vengado*, shows the rise in technical standard due to the exigencies of the audiences. Hamete is a simple Granadine Moor, talking bad Spanish and willing to be a Christian for the sake of a draught of wine; Tomín is equipped with funny stories to tell in and out of season, mimics Góngora every now and then, and constantly parodies the main action. Though Hamete is as amusing in a simple fashion as Tomín in a complex way, and though Tomín is no mere figure of straw, still one can

see in him an incipient Calderonian *gracioso*, straining at novelty and interrupting the action to conciliate the groundlings. Between *La Prueba de los Amigos* and *El Desdén Vengado* there is much similarity owing to fortuitous resemblances in the plot. The former is a 'Literarisierung des Lebens', as so often with Lope. The anti-heroine is called Dorotea, as in *La Dorotea*. Her inconstant affections are diverted to an *indiano* (here called Don Tello), because of his money, and Feliciano is a coxcomb as disagreeable in his way as Fernando in the autobiographical novel. Though the comedy has no Gerarda, it was composed with the *Celestina* in mind (721) and under Terentian influence (2254). The plot shows us a greedy courtesan who steals a young man from a worthy bride, and gets for herself his money; circumstances help him to win it all back and to marry the lady of unflinching constancy. This is also the plot of *El Desdén Vengado*, though set in the loftiest circles, as the other play was in middle-class houses and prisons. In neither play is there the smallest justification for the lady's constancy, obviously wasted on a nincompoop; 'love' is a mere motive for action, and is taken for granted. But a great deal more experience has gone to the making of the later play, in which the dialogue is much more polished, and effects are deliberately engineered. *La Batalla del Honor* and *El Bastardo Mudarra* lie between our extreme dates, and are examples of the *comedia heroica*. The former concerns an unnamed king of France, who is undoubtedly François I, the date being 1519 (825-6). The plot seems to have been Lope's own invention—and not a very happy one—inspired, perhaps, by reading the *Heptaméron*. The twenty-fifth novel in that work ascribed to François the use of 'subtle means' in his amorous adventures, and the forty-second showed that he could be opposed by a virtuous woman ('Contenance d'une jeune fille contre l'opiniâtre poursuite amoureuse d'un des grands seigneurs de France, et l'heureux succès qu'en eut la demoiselle'). Lope supposes that the King lays amorous siege to the wife of the Admiral of France, and is successfully opposed by the latter's jealous strategy, seconded by the lady's invincible honesty. The whole is tediously pursued through a military metaphor, which reaches its climax in the delusions of the Admiral when temporarily driven mad. Lope has not the knowledge of the human mind needed to depict its darker aberrations; the Admiral only achieves a sort of congruent silliness. *El Bastardo Mudarra* is the play in which Lope came to grips with the ancient epic tradition of his country. The Cid he seems to have avoided, perhaps as a figure too dominating for his treatment, and in other epical dramas the material was relatively scanty. But in this play he challenged comparison with a considerable number of the most authentic ballads, familiar to each one of his hearers. The ballads remain the more dramatic. The scene of the heads, in Lope, is rant rather than pathos or anger, and he loses the effect of surprise in the scene of Ruy Velázquez's death. Never quite happy among men, Lope imports some unnecessary females to lead up to marriages and the usual conventional ending. He could not string Ulysses' bow.

Hamete's Spanish, in *El Cordobés Valeroso*, is doubtless conventionally

bad, but has some Granadine qualities. One notices the lack of diphthongs from ě ō: *pedendo, ben, vendo, bon, bonos, fora, posto, fonte*, and the use of *li ni* for *ll nn*: *caliar, elia, seniora*. Hamete uses *o* for unaccented *u*, *e* for *i*, *b d g* for *p t k*, and is supposed quite unable to conjugate. He does not use *f* where Castilian has *h*, nor the diphthong *ei*, though these were characteristically Granadine (as in *Ferreirola*). Tomín's gongoristic parodies in *El Desdén Vengado* (125, 185, 2080, 2348) are very convincing. It is not when parodying Góngora, but when speaking in his normal 'conceptist' style, that he uses strange compounds like *porteridueño* and *perrigalgo*: compounds which Quevedo would have us believe (in his *Culta Latiniparla*) to be typically gongoristic. From lines 793, 924 and 878 it would appear that *Amadís* and *Celestina* were unfashionable in 1617, though an allusion to the *Celestina* was readily appreciated in 1604 (*La Prueba de los Amigos*, 721).

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

The Origins of the Romantic Movement in Spain. By I. L. McCLELLAND. Liverpool: Institute of Hispanic Studies. 1937. xii+402 pp. 18s.

With regard to any book on so indefinite a theme as 'Romanticism' it is the reviewer's first task to ascertain what definition is given of this term, or what concept implied, for the duration of the book. Miss McClelland does not, I think, define; but there is implication in the phrase that, in the eighteenth century, 'Spain, though invaded by neo-classicism, remained fundamentally Romantic', so that the Age of Reason, belying its name, was not an 'epoch in isolation, a strange, singularly un-Spanish period stretching between two detached ages of Romanticism'. Reviewing the literature of the eighteenth century she is concerned to show how the 'Romanticism' of Lope de Vega and Calderón links up with the Romanticisms of Rivas and Espronceda, if we regard as intrusive and extraneous that neo-classicism which has usually been considered the hall-mark of the epoch. To some readers the term 'Romantic', if applicable to such classicizing authors as Calderón and Cervantes, for instance, seems to have been stretched beyond the possibility of any precise meaning. The subject for such would be, not so much the *Origins of the Romantic Movement*, which is a movement of limited date and aesthetic achievement, but the continuity of Spanish literature during a period in which current opinion has thought that continuity to have been interrupted. In pursuance of this objective Miss McClelland studies, in three main divisions, the progress of the new art of literary criticism ('Romanticism in literary theory'), the tendencies in the drama and novel which actually commended themselves to the public ('Romanticism in drama and fiction'), and the growth of sensibility in lyrical verse ('Romanticism in lyrical and narrative poetry'). A full-length, or at least a three-quarter length, study of the eighteenth-century literature of Spain is in the hands of English readers at long last; we have no longer to complain that an interesting period continues to be ignored.

Pre-romanticism, that is to say the germs of the Romantic movement to be found in the neo-classical eighteenth century, has in recent years received considerable attention from authorities such as M. Mornet, M. Van Tieghem, and, among the hispanists, Professor E. Allison Peers. (The influence of Professor Peers, acknowledged in the preface of this book, is evident in the outlook, the method, and even in the style of Miss McClelland.) This research is, of course, perfectly legitimate. What is questionable, however, is Miss McClelland's attitude towards these germs of Spanish Romanticism, which are looked upon as the saving grace of the eighteenth century; they form a pleasant path from the Golden Age to the Romantic period through what would otherwise be a barren desert. Our critic rejoices that the eighteenth century failed, and quotes Ganivet's saying, 'No te debes vencer por nada extraño a tu espíritu' (p. 2). This attitude, only too common in England, is the result of our narrow conception of Hispanic studies, by which we mean only 'belles lettres'. On the Continent, and particularly in France, where a more humanistic spirit prevails, the historical phenomenon is considered as a whole, and the importance of the Spanish eighteenth century is fully realized. It is true that the French have patriotic reasons for adopting this attitude. None the less, one could, taking the broad view of history, apply to Spain the paradox Michelet pronounced about France, when he said: 'le grand siècle—c'est le 18^e siècle que je veux dire'. Indeed, it is a feasible proposition that Spain has become the sick man of Europe because the eighteenth century failed, and because the Romantic spirit thwarted the logical development of Spanish history.

Miss McClelland has no doubts of this kind. She does not answer this question, because she is very little interested in ideas. Indeed, the ideological background of her book is very thin. We are presented with innumerable summaries of obscure works with hints at elements in them which are for some reason considered Romantic. For example, the whole of the third and last part of the book is devoted to eighteenth-century poetry, a subject of little importance which has already received more than due attention in the *Historia crítica de la poesía castellana en el siglo 18* of Leopoldo Augusto de Cueto, Marqués de Valmar.

The result of this narrowness of vision is a certain inadequacy when questions not purely literary are mentioned. For example, England is described as the 'arch-enemy and racial opposite' of Spain (p. 2). This expression is quite inapplicable after say 1763, when public feeling became distinctly francophile and anglophile, and the Pacte de Famille remained a purely political thing without popular support. Innumerable writers, among them Antonio Ponz, could be quoted to prove this. We may, in this connexion, reproduce a passage from the *Travels* of the Anglo-Italian Baretti, concerning the Spanish theatre. It is an eighteenth-century manifestation of that admiration expressed at the beginning of the next century by Lord Holland (quoted by Miss McClelland, p. 4): 'I am so far an admirer of these two poets (Lope de Vega and Calderón) as to rank them both in the very first class of poetical geniuses. The copiousness and originality of their invention... (etc., etc.)... fill me with

such an enthusiasm as to make me cross rapidly over the ocean of their errors, and forget the frigid dictates of sober reason.' Indeed, 'the present race of playwrights in France and England, the driest and coldest that ever any theatrical age produced, instead of neglecting or condemning the dramatic compositions of Spain, would not do amiss to read many of them, especially those of *de Vega* and *Calderon*, not to imitate them at all, but to warm and fecundate their own cold and barren imaginations' (*Travels*, III, 267). This passage is typical of the hispanophile reaction which triumphed in England towards the middle of the eighteenth century, and corresponded to an often attested anglophile reaction in Spanish public opinion. Curiously enough, English travellers in Spain in this period very often use the expression 'very romantick'.

Much as one may, and in the opinion of the present critic should, disagree with Miss McClelland's thesis, none could deny that hispanists are very much indebted to the author for providing them with a work of very careful scholarship. This thick volume is obviously the product of intense research in the literature of the eighteenth century, many fairly inaccessible works being analysed and studied. If the seriousness of Miss McClelland's book, the second in the series of literary monographs to be published by the Institute of Hispanic Studies, be an indication of the standard of forthcoming volumes in the series, English hispanism is destined to make very real progress.

Miss McClelland provides us with a very useful select bibliography. It must be admitted that some of the books mentioned seem rather irrelevant, while others, of importance for the subject in question, are omitted. We may mention Kany's *Life and Manners in Madrid, 1750-1800*, Luigi Sorrento's *Battaglie e Sorgenti di Idee*, and Paul Mérimée's *L'Influence française en Espagne au dix-huitième siècle*. The last book possibly appeared too late to be included.

R. HILTON.

OXFORD.

The Raeto-Romans. By PEIDER LANSEL. Translated by M. Elizabeth Maxfield. Chur: Bischofsberger. 1937. 32 pp.

This lecture by the Swiss consul at Livorno was originally delivered at Milan in 1935, and has since been translated into Romansh, German and French. The author is a well-known Romansh poet, and can therefore speak with authority on the considerable literary activity in that tongue and on the ideals which inspire the leaders of the Romansh renaissance. To the foreign reader (including, thanks to Miss Maxfield, English and American readers) the lecture is interesting as a conspectus of the subject, supported by a sufficient bibliography. There is a map; but it is a pity that the map should not give the names cited in the text. Importance is assigned to the river Landquart on p. 13, but the map gives only a town of that name; the words 'Engadine' and 'Val Müstair' appear on p. 18, but not on the map. There is an obscure saying on p. 25 that certain words in Romansh 'indicate a closer adherence to the Latin than the Italian ever had' (why 'ever'?), and on p. 20 that 'Catalan and

Raeto-Romance can then to a certain degree consider themselves twin languages, a fact, paradoxical in appearance, which serves to illustrate that dialects most widely separated geographically may be most closely related linguistically'. The author and translator prefer 'Raeto-' to 'Rhaeto-' as having better Classical authority. They define the subject as that part of Ladino which is in use among the 40,000 Swiss of the Grisons, where 'the Ladino patrimony has been most faithfully preserved'. The region was occupied by tribes not of Celtic but Illyrian origin, and, after Odoacer withdrew the legions, was reorganized by the bishops of Chur, finally entering the Swiss Confederation in 1803. There is thus no ground for asserting the *italianità* of the Grisons, as certain irredentists have done (just as there is no ground for asserting the *italianità* of Malta). Some interesting particulars are given as to the Germanizing and Latinizing of place-names in the canton; and it is claimed that 'the Raeto-Romans possess in their age-old language a veritable magic key, greatly facilitating not only the study of the Neo-Latin languages but also the Germanic idioms'. Such a key is naturally of value in trilingual Switzerland. The claim for official recognition does not envisage imposing knowledge of Romansh upon other persons, but authority for its use where it is actually spoken.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Volkssprache und Wortschatz des Badischen Frankenlandes, dargestellt auf Grund der Mundart von Oberschefflenz. By EDWIN ROEDDER. New York: Modern Language Association of America. 1936. xxvi + 606 pp. 22s. 6d.

A number of years ago the author of the present volume conceived a plan which he formulates thus: 'einmal zwischen zwei Buchdeckeln die Gesamtheit der Erscheinungen im Leben einer Dorfgemeinde von der Frühzeit bis auf die lebendige Gegenwart nach Möglichkeit zusammenzufassen und in ihrer inneren Einheitlichkeit darzustellen' (p. vii). Three chapters of the story of Oberschefflenz according to the plan thus formulated have been dealt with in a separate volume.¹ The new one deals with the dialect of the village.

Herr Roedder's intensive study of the one dialect enables him to throw interesting light on some of the fundamental problems relating to dialects in general ('Mundart' and 'Halbmundart' and the differences between the speech-styles of successive generations) and incidentally convinces us that the 'village monograph' is still more than a well-documented card in the dialect-geographer's reference-index. So much for the general bearing of the study.

The author has not taken his task lightly. He is nothing if not complete in his information in the chapters on phonology and morphology. Under the heading 'Die Worte' he gives a complete primer of the dialect. Typical of the desire to be complete is a list of the Strong Verbs which,

attested in Middle High German, are lacking in the dialect. And so on through the syntax.¹ Fully half the book is given up to specimens of Oberschefflenz speech and to the dictionary. Herr Roedder begins with two transcriptions of Wenker's forty sentences—the one on which the Sprachatlas draws, and his own. (One notes certain divergences—the author is a more skilled phonetician than the original referee—but the comparison is on the whole reassuring.) The dictionary is full, and contains much which should be of interest to the folk-lorist as well as to the linguist. We must be grateful to the author for his zeal and patience, but at the same time express the pious hope that few will follow him. May we be allowed to accept this monograph as a representative and adequate account of the sum total of linguistic phenomena which one dialect can offer!

German reviewers will doubtless complain that Herr Roedder has merely amassed information (which would have been the making of five or six doctor's dissertations) and not fulfilled the second part of his projected plan, which was 'die Gesamtheit der Erscheinungen... zusammenzufassen und in ihrer inneren Einheitlichkeit darzustellen'. We join him in being sceptical of the facile manner in which many German scholars would turn *Sprachgeschichte* into *Kulturgeschichte* and *Sprachkunde* into *Seelenkunde*. It is futile to try to fathom the psyche of a community on the basis of its speech. Herr Roedder is very honest in stating that even on the basis of a study of 'Landschaft', 'Geschichte', 'Volkstum' (the subject of his first volume) and language he will not make the attempt. The weak point in his armour is that he set out with the intention of reaching that goal. The accumulated material will have to stand on its own merits, which we hold to be considerable.²

F. P. PICKERING.

MANCHESTER.

¹ For most Germanists an account such as the present is interesting only in so far as it throws light on differences between the dialect and the Standard. Here are a few examples. (Word formation)—The *-er* termination can denote only the habitual agent, thus *der Verfasser des Briefes* is not permissible since *der Verfasser* is one whose normal occupation it is to *verfassen*. Abstracts in *-heit* and *-keit* are rare. (Syntax)—Some generally accepted views are confirmed (universal statements of the type *der Mensch ist gut, die Kuh ist ein dummes Tier* are not normal) whilst others are refuted (the passive is a more favoured construction than in the Standard: *heute wird nicht gearbeitet, heute wird sich amüsiert: da wird sich nicht lange besonnen*).

² The book has been published under difficult conditions, and we will not refer to inconsistencies in arrangement for which the author has made adequate excuse in his Foreword. There are a number of ugly misprints, which are however immediately recognizable as such. In addition: for *schrift* read *schrift* (p. xiii); for *gewest*, *gewest* (p. 72), etc. On p. 10 there are references to authors but not to works. Further, the scant use of italics and general typographical resources is annoying. The general principle followed is to use German terminology throughout even when such monstrous forms as *Verunähnlichung* (dissimilation) have to serve, but there are stray *Infinitiva* amongst the *Nennformen*, *Partizipia* amongst the *Mittelworte* and *Plurale* amongst the *Mehrzahlen*.

Many of Herr Roedder's etymologies and his interpretations of phonological developments, and some of his statements on fundamentals ('Die beharrlichsten und festesten Äusserungen des Sprachlebens sind die der Wortfügung', p. 232) would call for closer examination if space permitted.

De Middelnederlandsche Tauler-handschriften. By G. I. LIEFTINCK. Groningen-Batavia: J. B. Wolters' Uitgevers-maatschappij N.V. 1936. xxxiv + 443 pp. fl. 5.90.

This is an unusually thorough and meticulous study of the problems connected with the Middle Dutch Tauler manuscripts, genuine and otherwise. R. Langenberg¹ and C. G. N. de Vooys² investigated the extent of Eckart's influence in the Netherlands, and A. G. M. van de Wijnpersse edited the oldest translation of Suso's *Horologium*,³ but the Dutch Tauleriana had not found an editor until now. Yet Tauler seems to have had connexions with his Brabant contemporary Jan van Ruusbroec, as witness the extract of the latter's *Vanden vier becoringhen*, which occurs in an early German Tauler-manuscript.⁴ Lieftinck has now given us a full account of all the Middle Dutch manuscripts containing sermons that were attributed to Tauler by the scribes. He had intended to produce a critical text based on these that was to have come as near as possible to the original translation of a number of Tauler's own sermons, but this project had to be abandoned. For the manuscripts do not all go back to the same original, and none of them is appreciably nearer to the oldest German tradition than the others. (The earliest Dutch Tauler MS. must be dated about 1440.) The more important part of the thesis is therefore the second: the edition of a number of anonymous mystical tracts which are included among the Middle Dutch collections of Tauler's sermons.⁵

The introduction is mainly based on G. Fischer's *Geschichte der Entdeckung der deutschen Mystiker Eckhart, Tauler und Seuse im XIX. Jahrhundert* and on H. Grundmann's *Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen⁶ Mystik* (Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift, xii (1934)) and *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Historische Studien, Heft 267, Berlin, 1935). But the value of the work lies in the minutely accurate description of the manuscripts, and in the comparison and classification of these in relation to the German collections of Tauler's sermons. The author shows himself to be entirely conversant with the filiation of the German Tauler-manuscripts, and with the way in which they have been utilized for the editions of Vetter and Corin. For the Dutch manuscripts he had a reliable guide in W. Dolch's Leipzig *Inaugural-Dissertation: Die Verbreitung oberländischer Mystikerwerke im Niederländischen* (Weida i. Th., 1909), although some of the latter's conclusions had to be revised, as three more Dutch Tauler-manuscripts had been discovered since. Lieftinck is able to correct Dolch on several important points. He classifies the manuscripts in two groups, which in his opinion represent

¹ *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Mystik* (1902).

² *Meister Eckart en de Nederlandse mystiek.* Archief voor Nederl. Kerkgeschiedenis, N.S. iii (1905).

³ *De Driete vertaling van Suso's 'Horologium aeternae sapientiae'.* Diss. Utrecht (1926).

⁴ Lieftinck, pp. 207-8, where the literature on this question is summarized.

⁵ The very numerous sixteenth-century Tauler-MSS. have been excluded, as they are all based on older translations.

⁶ 'germanisch' would have been more exact, as Grundmann rightly includes the Netherlands, where the *béguinages* flourished as early as in Germany.

two different original collections of Tauler's sermons in Dutch. The former collection seems to have been preserved quite satisfactorily in three manuscripts that are very nearly contemporary (Utrecht Univ. Bibl. 1027; Brussels Royal Libr. 2283/84; Brussels Royal Libr. 643/44). An edition of the Utrecht manuscript with the variants found in the two others should prove of value for the constitution of a German critical text based on MS. Engelberg, the Codices Vindob. 2739 and 2744 and the above-mentioned Dutch translations. Of the latter collection, which *might* be related to the manuscripts discussed by A. Spamer,¹ a faint reflection is found in the manuscripts of the second group.

The relation between all these manuscripts, and their relative importance for the eventual reconstruction of the (two?) original translations, are illustrated and discussed on pp. 155-208 by means of short characteristic passages from the editions of Vetter or Corin, printed side by side with their parallels in various Middle Dutch manuscripts.

The influence of Eckart is noticeable in a number of the Middle Dutch Tauleriana. This was to be expected, for De Vooys had shown that Eckart's writings were not only known in the North-Eastern Netherlands but also in Brabant, among Ruusbroec's disciples, who however regarded him as a dangerous heretic. One manuscript (Brussels, No. 643/44) contains three complete sermons usually ascribed to Eckart (1, 2; 1, 6 and 1, 42 in Pfeiffer's edition) which are of great importance for the constitution of a satisfactory text. They enabled J. Quint² to correct many corrupt readings in Pfeiffer's edition. Lieftinck adds one that had escaped Quint's notice.

I have not been able to check the accuracy of Lieftinck's readings by referring to any of the manuscripts, but there is every indication that this part of the work is in keeping with the other sections, which all evince scrupulous scholarship. There is a full bibliography and an index, whilst reference to the editions of Vetter, Corin, Helander and others is facilitated by a table of all the manuscripts discussed. Under each heading is a complete list of the tracts contained in the manuscript, and the genuine Tauler-sermons are numbered according to Vetter, or according to Corin and others if they do not occur in Vetter's edition.

TH. WEEVERS.

LONDON.

Letter from Heaven on the Observance of the Lord's Day. By ROBERT PRIEBSCH. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1936. xxiii+37 pp. 4s. 6d.

This study has been edited from Professor Priebisch's papers by Professor W. E. Collinson and Dr August Closs. The cost of publication has been borne by the fund which was raised after Priebisch's death, from which also a Robert Priebisch Prize has been established in the University of London where he held his Chair of German from 1902 to 1931. This

¹ *Über die Zersetzung und Vererbung in den deutschen Mystikerwerken.* Diss. Giessen, 1910, pp. 84 sqq.

² *Die Überlieferung der deutschen Predigten Meister Eckeharts textkritisch* Bonn, 1932.

present small volume contains a portrait, a memoir by Professor Collinson which sets forth 'the main facts of a remarkable career for the sake of his many friends', and a bibliography of the Professor's work compiled by Professor F. Norman.

The *Himmelsbrief* or Sunday Letter occupied the author throughout his life; the views here expressed were first published in a lecture delivered in Liverpool in 1897. From the wording of the editors' brief Introduction the reader might naturally assume that the present study, while lacking 'his finishing touches', represents substantially a complete statement of Pribsch's view of the subject at the time of his death. That is not so: the present text was written many years ago, and in the meantime Pribsch had kept himself fully abreast of recent work. He had intended to rewrite this paper in the light of that recent work, and in justice to the memory of a great scholar the editors should have clearly stated that fact.

The Letter from Heaven has indeed a most remarkable history; through the centuries it has continued to be treasured in popular devotion, though at times condemned by ecclesiastical authority. Its countless forms defy any rigorously scientific classification, and the innumerable variants are in themselves a striking witness to its popularity. It has been regarded as a charm protecting the house from fire or as an amulet shielding the faithful who bore it on their persons from disease and danger. It is particularly potent against the demons who are ever ready to attack women in child-birth, and since 1791 it has been most frequently employed as a safeguard against death by firearms. It has figured in all the wars of the nineteenth century as an amulet and was carried by soldiers on all fronts in the Great War. Faith in its efficacy has been shared alike by Catholics and Protestants.¹

The present study concerns Redaction I of the Sunday Letter², and Professor Pribsch discusses at length the question of the letter's place of origin and possible sources. A few years ago it was urged that the letter must originally have been written in Greek, for there are, it was contended, clear 'Graecisms' in the Latin text. Delehaye in 1899³ inclined to a western origin for the letter, but in 1901 Carl Schmidt published a fragment of a Coptic text which contains the closest eastern parallel to the view of the letter on the duty of Sunday observance.⁴ This text purports to be written by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, who was martyred in the persecution of Maximin; the authenticity of this document was upheld by Schmidt. It may be worth while to quote some lines of this fragmentary text in Schmidt's translation:

Und ich befehle euch dass man nichts tue an dem Tage des heiligen Sonntags und sich nicht befinde in Streitereien und Gerichten und Gewalttätigkeiten, sondern dass

¹ Cf. R. Stübe, *Der Himmelsbrief. Ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte*. Tübingen, Mohr, 1918 (with a very useful bibliography).

² At some future date the editors hope to proceed to the publication of the Professor's work upon Redactions II, III and IV.

³ Cf. Pribsch, p. 10, n. 4.

⁴ Carl Schmidt, *Fragment einer Schrift des Märtyrerbischofs Petrus von Alexandrien*. Leipzig und Unters. N.F. 5 (1901), Heft 4, Abh. 2.

man achtgebe auf die Verlesung der heiligen Schriften und Brot gebe dem Bedürftigen. Wer streitet oder gewalttätig handelt oder wer richtet verkehrt oder wer zurückfordert von irgend Jemand irgend einen Gegenstand am Tage des Sonntags und den andern bekannten grossen Festen—solche sollten sein ausserhalb der Gemeinschaft der Christen, seien es Kleriker, seien es Laien. Verflucht ist der welcher verrichten wird irgend etwas am Tage des heiligen Sonntags, ausgenommen die der Seele forderlichen Dinge und die Verpflegung des Viehes.

But can such a view of the Christian Sunday have really been expressed before the legislation of Constantine? Delehaye considered that this was unlikely, and from the internal evidence of the fragment itself has argued that the document is pseudonymous and may perhaps be dated some 150 years later than the lifetime of Peter of Alexandria. The similarities of the Coptic text when the latter is compared with the Sunday Letter are so striking that Delehaye thought that the letter may well be derived from this pseudonymous document.¹

Now it has been shown in an elaborate study by Maximilian Bittner² that all the oriental versions of the letter are derived from a single Greek text, and that text places the appearance of the letter in Rome. Against the view that the Greek text of the letter was its primary form Professor Stübe has argued with force that a Greek would not have chosen a West European city for the descent of the letter: he would have selected an eastern city, such, for instance, as the sacred city of Jerusalem, which is in fact chosen in the later secondary form of the Greek legend. Professor Stübe considers that the most probable place of origin for the letter is Merovingian Gaul of the sixth century, and for a parallel to the views of the letter on the observance of Sunday he quotes the 280th sermon in the collected works of Augustine which is not Augustinian and should probably be attributed to Caesarius of Arles. Here he is at one with Pribsch, save that the latter would find its origin amongst the Visigoths rather than among the Franks. It is still, of course, possible that a Latin version of the pseudonymous document of which the Coptic fragment has been preserved had reached the West and had inspired the author of the letter. Rome, it must be remembered, was in close touch with Alexandria during the dogmatic controversies of the fifth century. The attribution of the document to Peter of Alexandria may have even suggested the descent of the letter upon the altar of S. Peter's. Thus the parallels adduced by Pribsch from sixth-century Spanish and Gallic sources would still retain their value as a reflection of the legalistic rigorism which in Western Europe applied to the Christian Sunday the obligations of the Jewish Sabbath.

The student has every reason to be grateful for the wealth of material which this publication has put into his hands.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

LONDON.

¹ *An. Boll.* xx, 101-3.

² *Denkschriften d. Kais. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl.* LI (1906), Abh. 1. Vienna.

Notkers des Deutschen Werke. Edited by E. H. SEHRT and TAYLOR STARK. (*Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, 37.) 2. Band: Marcius Capella, *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. Halle: Niemeyer. 1935. viii+220 pp. 5 M.

The Introduction to this volume is even shorter than that to vol. I of the projected complete edition of Notker's works, and it is hardly as satisfactory.¹ Four pages are devoted to the manuscript, text, and commentary (pp. v-viii), and as p. v has a generous top-margin and p. viii is largely a list of abbreviations, in effect the introduction is reduced to three pages. Two of these are taken up with a description of the manuscript. We are told that the text appears on pp. 2-170 of the St Gall Codex 872, but we are not told what else the codex contains. If we wish to discover the format we have to turn to J. Kelle, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, I (1892), 236. There we shall learn that we are dealing with a quarto. The manuscript is partly a palimpsest. The editors state (p. v): 'Der ausgelöschte, nur wenig ältere Text, der eines lateinischen Traktates, war auf grossen Blättern geschrieben, die gefaltet wurden und je zwei Blätter hergaben. . . .' This must mean that the older Latin grammatical text was written on single leaves of folio size. If so, they must have been bound together by stabbing, and there should still be traces of the holes visible. We search in vain for information. The practice of giving so-called palaeographical details in text-editions should cease unless editors are willing to discover what a palaeographer would wish to know. Neither linguist nor literary historian wants to know any of this, and for the palaeographer there is not enough information. Apparently the manuscript is written by two scribes only, and the editors correct Steinmeyer's contrary statements. Since Steinmeyer was one of the most trustworthy and careful of scholars, a little more than bare statement would have been welcome.

The punctuation of the text has been modelled on that adopted for the edition of Boethius *De Consolatione Philosophiae*. There is a discussion of twelve lines of the text. The prepositions, *an*, *mit* and the personal pronoun *dir* are now supplied with an acute accent following on Mr C. T. Carr's article.² Otherwise the treatment is the same as that in the Boethius edition. Notker's Latin is reprinted with a few emendations. The editors realize that the question of the sources is by no means settled, but all they are able to contribute to the problem is: 'Die Geschichte des lateinischen Capellatextes bedarf noch der näheren Untersuchung'.

Fifteen lines on Notker's commentary complete this meagre introduction. We are informed that the commentary is largely taken from Remigius, which everybody knows. The editors add that Remigius is not the only source. This everybody knows, too. But there are no further suggestions, and that is to be regretted.

The text has been most carefully edited, and scrupulous attention to detail has insured that this edition is far and away the best that has yet

¹ For vol. I cf. F. Norman, *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxx, 119 ff.

² Cf. *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxx, 187 ff., and E. H. Sehrt and Taylor Stark, 'Notker's accentuation of the prepositions *an*, *in*, *mit*', *Mod. Lang. Notes*, II, 81 ff.

appeared. But whilst the reader may be grateful for the reliable and methodical work done here, he will also wish that the editors, who possess an unrivalled knowledge of Notker's works, had done a little towards an elucidation of the many unsolved literary problems. Perhaps it is intended to produce a monograph on the subject some time later. There is no hint anywhere of such an intention, and lest their careful scholarship should ultimately prove largely barren, we should like to remind them that the work of an editor does not end after he has established an accurate text. That is the beginning.

LONDON.

F. NORMAN.

Textliste neuhochdeutscher Vorlesesprache, schlesischer Färbung. By E. and K. ZWIRNER. Berlin: Metten. 1936. viii+100 pp. M. 8.

It is the intention of Dr Zwirner and his colleagues to present the fruits of their work in phonometry in two series of publications, the first series to be an exposition of the general principles and methods of phonometry, and the second to present in the form of texts and tables the results of phonometrical research. This book is the first of the second series to be published.

It consists mainly of tables giving the data concerning a passage spoken by a German speaker and recorded on a gramophone record. In all, two thousand sounds were studied and experimental methods were used to measure the duration, pitch variations and speech power of each sound. In addition, three trained listeners were employed to judge the length, tone and stress of all vowels or syllabic consonants. It is the possibility of comparing the experimental results with the subjective judgements that gives the *Textliste* its main interest.

Such a comparison reveals repeated and striking discrepancies between the two, as for instance when all three listeners judge a sound lasting .11 sec. to be long and the succeeding vowel, lasting .10 sec., to be short; or when they note a rising tone in a vowel of which the actual fall is represented by a value -45° . And these are by no means isolated examples in the texts. Dr Zwirner's results would seem to raise once again the whole question of the relation of subjective impression to objective measurement and the validity of the application of experimental methods to linguistic phenomena. It will be interesting to see what conclusions Dr Zwirner himself will draw from the results tabulated in this volume, conclusions which will doubtless appear in a future publication.

As the book does not contain an account of the methods used in obtaining the measurements, an examination of these methods would be out of place in this notice. One point which does seem to call for comment, however, is that in the measurement of pitch variations, the experimental method does not appear to take sufficiently into account the major fluctuations in pitch within the syllable, and consequently the occurrence of any of the six 'kombinierte Melodieklassen' (rising-falling, falling-rising, etc.) cannot be reflected in the numerical results.

The problem of the presentation of the data has, on the whole, been adequately solved and the book is remarkably free from errors. The only error of any importance occurs in the list of variants, where the word 'Bosporus' is given twice with the same pronunciation instead of with two different ones.

D. B. FRY.

LONDON.

Un Poète Romantique Allemand: Ludwig Tieck (1773-1853). By ROBERT MINDER. (*Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg*, 72.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 1936. viii + 516 pp. 60 fr.

In a prefatory note to this comprehensive work the author gives a concise formulation of his aim in undertaking a full-length study of a poet of 'sensitive and nebulous personality' and of 'rich and unequal achievement': it is to make this achievement live again, in all its originality, and to relate it both to the inner problems of the artist himself and to the general tendencies of his age. In fulfilling this aim, M. Minder has given us a work of major importance, offering that synthesis which has hitherto been lacking in biographies and criticism of Tieck. From its pages there emerges a coherent picture of a complex and elusive personality, the main lines of whose development are shown through analysis of the different phases of his creative work in the first part, while fuller details are supplied in the more numerous sections of the second part devoted to the poet's emotional and aesthetic experience. Such a division into analysis of the poetic work in one part and analysis of the poet's mind and outlook in another has dangers no less serious, if less obvious, than the familiar ones of the biographical method. But except in some relatively unimportant details, M. Minder has been singularly successful in avoiding both unreal divisions and unnecessary repetitions. His book is clearly the fruit of long preoccupation with his theme, and has the certainty which comes from constant subjection of the material to a process of reflection. An effect almost as of musical structure is produced by the framework of prologue and epilogue—the overture and *finale* to a work of many variations. In the former, the 'leading themes' of Tieck's inner experience and his poetic work are stated; in the latter, the essential characteristics of the poet and his work are woven into a harmonious whole, and are estimated in their relation to the literature of his own time and of the later nineteenth century. The insistent problem presented by the variations of Tieck's life and work is here stated afresh: 'Qu'est-ce donc que cette résistance qui surgit après chaque enthousiasme, que cette lucidité—ou cette fatigue, que cet élément d'apparence anti-romantique qui vient corriger ou contredire l'élan romantique?' (p. 434). And to the problem thus formulated an answer is offered by an analysis of what the critic considers to be the central quality in Tieck—the quality of 'grace', which is '*a priori* neither romantic nor anti-romantic'. This delight in grace governs not only his own work, but his tastes in music and painting. 'Bien qu'elle s'abandonne facilement à des caprices d'allure romantique, elle contient cependant en elle-même un élément

d'équilibre, un sens nécessaire de la mesure, un goût presque classique de l'harmonie' (p. 435). Had Tieck united these qualities in perfection, M. Minder argues, he might have defied the distinction between classic and romantic art, as did some of his favourite artists—Mozart, or Shakespeare in his comedies. But grace in him was not primarily a revelation of inner harmony; it denoted a lack of force, of spiritual energy—the defect of a Correggio, whom Tieck preferred to many greater painters. In this analysis of Tieck's feeling for grace in art, with its corollaries of resistance to the deeper and more exacting forms of experience and cultivation of an ironic detachment, M. Minder presents a convincing picture. And if his use of 'romantic' and 'anti-romantic' suggests a somewhat rigid definition of those terms, at least his interpretation of Tieck's 'romanticism' is marked by the sympathy without which no account of this poet can be more than a collection of material.

The larger part of the book is devoted to a detailed study of Tieck's temperament, experience, and outlook upon life and art—under the rather forbidding title 'Formation et aspects de la sensibilité et de l'idéologie tieckiennes'; but throughout the whole work the reader is made fully aware that M. Minder approaches his subject primarily from the point of view of psychological analysis. There is indeed a slightly self-conscious emphasis on the modernity of the paraphrases that are sometimes offered: 'En langage psychologique: union très intime du "complexe-voir" et du "complexe-savoir"' (p. 92) is for example the explanation given for Tieck's characteristic technique of multiple reflection of a single incident, while on another occasion (p. 188) his enthusiasm for the past is described, with a reference to Jung, as a 'complexe archaïque'. But if there is almost a note of challenge in M. Minder's emphasis on a psychological approach, his method vindicates itself in virtue of the acuteness of artistic perception and of literary judgment evinced in every chapter. And the division into two parts is perhaps more appropriate to a study of Tieck than to that of greater artists, whose work is more homogeneous. The survey of his creative work in the first part—which is no more than a third of the whole book—is indeed particularly illuminating in its emphasis on the underlying connexions between works that belong to different periods of Tieck's life; and at a time when the trend of historical events or of philosophical thought is so frequently considered to be of paramount importance for the understanding of a poet, it is refreshing to find M. Minder insisting, quietly and convincingly, on the deeper springs of Tieck's creative work. This part of the book presupposes some considerable knowledge of the facts; it is, however, so admirably documented throughout that the reader who finds his knowledge inadequate will have no difficulty in supplementing it from original sources. M. Minder's work is not only full of penetrating comments and felicitous phrases; it offers to the serious student of Tieck a finished portrait, together with ample material for judging its likeness to the original. The book is completed by an excellent bibliography.

EDNA PURDIE.

LONDON.

Bürger's Originality. By E. S. BLENKINSOP. Oxford: Blackwell. 1937. 142 pp. 4s. 6d.

The title of this slender volume is perhaps somewhat misleading in seeming to imply a greater claim for Bürger than the author actually seeks to establish. We soon learn, however, that by the term 'originality' he means Bürger's originality of style, particularly in his adaptations (cf. p. 19), or else what we are more accustomed to think of as 'Bürgers Manier'. It is no misrepresentation of the author's intention to state that he is mainly concerned to divest of its force this expression of Schlegel's, nor of his achievement to state that he at times seems almost to succeed, so that we are nearly persuaded.

In a brief Introduction we are reminded of Bürger's fate at the hands of Schiller and Schlegel as critics, of how Bürger remained, until the centenary of his death, in Schiller's 'fatal embrace', but has since then escaped into Schlegel's protection, yet only 'as from the frying pan into the fire' (p. 9). 'The purpose of this book', we are told, 'is to suggest that Schlegel's Essay, in spite of its brilliance, is not a complete or satisfactory introduction to the works of a poet...who continued to write poems not unworthy of *Lenore* for twenty years.'

But now let us turn to the end of the book, where the author quotes a passage from Schlegel's summing-up, welcoming it to our surprise as an 'appreciation of the greatness of Bürger's poetry'. In this passage Schlegel says in effect that Bürger in his ballads and light lyrics (as distinct from lyrical poetry proper) creates at times genuine popular poetry, and that his style (when not marred by his wilful and habitual manner) achieves clarity, vigour, and freshness—elegance sometimes, greatness more rarely. This 'appreciation of the greatness of Bürger's poetry', the author says (of a passage that damns it with faint praise), is yet 'not sufficient to efface the impression created by Schlegel's unfavourable criticism of so many individual poems throughout his essay'. One might reasonably reply that it was obviously not intended to do so; but that if Mr Blenkinsop is finally content with this assessment by Schlegel of Bürger's 'originality', so are his readers, though they may still be ill at ease over Mr Blenkinsop's added implication of originality.

It is perhaps impossible to do justice to this work in a brief review. The arguments employed to refute Schiller and Schlegel are ingenious; as for instance in the first of fifteen short chapters, where the slightness of Schiller's *personal* acquaintance with Bürger is held by the author (as by Schlegel himself) to nullify Schiller's conclusions, which were derived from linking criticism of Bürger's personality with criticism of his poetry. We are doubtless expected to agree with this contention. But who is willing to agree further with Mr Blenkinsop in suspending therefore a sovereign principle of criticism, in favour of one by which he recognizes that 'a man so skilled in the use of words as Bürger assumes many different personalities, according to his mood, or his audience' (p. 5)? It is of course kinder to Bürger to do so, to judge a selection of his individual poems merely 'by the standard of their own unity and

harmony' (p. 12); but this is to apply a standard which neglects the essential relation of poetry to its creator's life, experience and character.

Yet if we can bring ourselves to agree with the author in his attitude, as also in his view that enough has already been said by others about Bürger's manifold borrowings, we are left indebted to him for a book that performs to the full its elected task of demonstrating that in his better poetry Bürger attains his ideals of 'vividness, unity and harmony'. The title should perhaps read accordingly.

DOUGLAS YATES.

ABERDEEN.

Comedy in Germany in the First Half of the Eighteenth Century. By BETSY AIKIN-SNEATH. (Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1936. 122 pp. With five plates. 7s. 6d.

Miss Aikin-Sneath has chosen for her study that strange period in German dramatic literature which seems so incredibly remote from the latter part of the same century. In her concise and well-arranged little volume she presents a mass of valuable and interesting material, and 'includes works on the theory of comedy as well as the comedies themselves, since theory and practice are closely related at the time'. The first brief chapter deals with various Theories of Laughter, while the two succeeding chapters are devoted in turn to the Theory of Comedy of Gottsched and his successors and to that of J. E. Schlegel. Gottsched is given full credit for the sound elements in his critical work and for his genuine patriotism; 'he was at heart a fervent lover of German culture'. This is quite in keeping with the modern 'Rettung' of 'Gottsched der Deutsche', who has now received amends for Lessing's injustices. Given the rationalistic approach to literature of an apostle of enlightenment, with its moralizing and utilitarian philosophy, he was bound to condemn the irresponsibility of the popular plays, while to his fundamentally humourless nature their spontaneous merriment made no appeal.

Chapters v and vi deal with the Regular Comedy, the praiseworthy aim of which was to replace the coarse fare of the strolling players by plays which should have a beneficial moral and social influence. The best of them, such as *Der Bookesbeutel* or *Die Geistlichen auf dem Lande*, are interesting for the pictures they draw of the manners of the age, but it is heavy going to read most of them to-day, and the audiences too apparently found them, with a few notable exceptions, not too entertaining. For an appeal to the audience many of these 'regular' writers appear to have fallen from grace and smuggled in effects learnt from their unprincipled and mercenary rivals.

For all these praiseworthy efforts, it is to the 'rogues and vagabonds' of the Popular Comedy (Chapter III) that we return with interest. Miss Aikin-Sneath has given us a good picture of these popular entertainers of the day. 'The actors hardly differed from the tumblers and jugglers that strolled through the countryside.' The principals had a hard struggle to pay their way, and we are told of the side-lines by which

they added to their takings. The case of Stranitzky, the most famous of them all, to whom the book gives his due prominence, might have been quoted in this connexion, for as well as being actor and dramatist, he was in the daytime a dentist, having received in 1707 a diploma after examination by the faculty of medicine, while he was also a wine-merchant and a landed proprietor, and, presumably unlike most of them, left behind him a considerable fortune. He, like Prehauser and other famous principals, played in the *Haupt- und Staatsactionen* the part of Hans Wurst, who was generally the most important character, and had the most difficult and most esteemed task, that of extemporizing. *H. W. kann seine lazzi haben* is a common and significant stage-direction. Whatever they were not, and they did not aim at being instructive, or edifying or refined, or even proper, these plays were undoubtedly funny, and the author quotes from the letter which Lady Mary Wortley Montagu wrote to Pope from Vienna after seeing one of them in 1716: 'I never laughed so much in my life'.

In her Conclusion Miss Aikin-Sneath hazards the somewhat strange conjecture that we may see a return to the spirit of popular comedy, that 'the modern realization of the power of the masses... will perhaps make the response of the audience the determining factor in dramatic production', and that 'study of... the man who pays' may give us 'a comedy that will make the audience (those same masses?) laugh, not out of scorn or anger, but through very merriment'.

The book is excellently produced and well documented, and has, apart from the Bibliography, three valuable bibliographical appendices.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

In a monograph which shows considerable critical and selective faculty, *Die Aureate Terms als Stilelement bei Lydgate* (*Germanische Studien*, Heft 182, Berlin 1936), Dr Elfriede Tilgner makes a study of the language of late Middle English poetry as it was affected by the aureate vogue. Lydgate imitated direct from Chaucer such expressions as 'Mars army-potente', 'pleyes palestral' and 'folk predestynaat', and these phrases, used so sparingly and with such magnificent effect by the master, were varied and multiplied in the work of the disciple. And how imitable Lydgate was! Therefore he, more than Chaucer, set the pattern for a century with his 'termys off rétoryk and halff chongyd Latyne'. Dr Tilgner makes full use of the statistical material collected by P. H. Nichols and J. C. Mendenhall in their studies of aureate terms, and she refers to the dissertations on Romance loan-words in Lydgate and in Caxton respectively by Hans Faltenbacher and Georg Reismüller, but she is concerned more with style than with vocabulary and etymology. In an Appendix, however, she presents two interesting word-lists, of aureate

terms first recorded in rhymes, and of abstracta first introduced by Lydgate. In the main, it would seem, her investigation has proceeded along lines suggested by certain paragraphs in Professor W. F. Schirmer's valuable paper on *Dichter und Publikum zu Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts in England*. Having shown the precise nature of Lydgate's dependence upon Chaucer, she analyses a few only of his 140 thousand verses and discusses in detail some illustrative quotations. In conclusion she considers Lydgate's influence upon Hoccleve, Hawes, the nameless authoress of *The Flower and the Leaf*, Caxton and Skelton; Henryson, Dunbar, Douglas, Kennedy and Lindsay. Dr Tilgner's book is a useful contribution to our knowledge of the language of English poetry in the fifteenth century.

SIMEON POTTER.

Sir Paul Harvey's *Oxford Companion to English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2nd. ed. 1937. viii+912 pp. 15s.) has added some useful apparatus to its original equipment. Sir Frank Mackinnon's notes on Copyright are most helpful. He might well, however, have mentioned the important fact, in relation to the Stationers' Company, that copy was saleable and transferable from member to member. The inevitable weakness of such a book as this, fully realized by its compiler, is its inability to reflect full knowledge over an enormous field. The notes on Skelton and Puttenham, for example, take no account of recent important work, and indeed, on Skelton, of his translation of Diodorus, which is common knowledge. Adelard is not mentioned. The note on James I ignores him except as a prose-writer. The last editions referred to of Chapman and Skelton are those of 1873-5 and 1843 respectively. And the reader of Webster is directed to Dyce and Hazlitt, 1830 and 1856, instead of to Lucas's admirable modern edition. For Spenser we are referred to no edition. Among living scholars, we find, and very properly, E. K. Chambers, Greg, Pollard, Manly, Kittredge and Lowes, but we do not find R. W. Chambers, Grierson or Max Förster, or the late Sir Israel Gollancz. We find a minor novelist of to-day, Denis Mackail, but not J. W. Mackail. Such a book, again, should at any rate eschew speculation or opinion, of which there is a good deal, e.g. in the section on Shakespeare, or the note on Minot. One wonders why a few cricketers are singled out for mention in the realm of sport. I find no boxers or race-horses. There is a marked weakness in bibliographical matters, which is most serious.

In the main, however, the book responds to search at random, and will certainly be most helpful to the general reader, for whom it is presumably intended. But if it is to be of service to students, it must undergo a very thorough revision.

C. J. Sisson.

In *The Sonnets of Shakespeare, A Psycho-Sexual Analysis* (privately printed. Columbia, U.S.A. 1936. 121 pp.) Mr H. McClure Young indicates the normality of Shakespeare's constitution and of the contents of the sonnets, from accusations which can, in fact, hardly be taken

seriously except as comments upon their authors, Butler, Wilde or Rolfe; Mr Young's common sense is his best weapon, more potent than his psychological equipment or his not quite full-armed scholarship. Mr Young maintains that Southampton is the hero of the sonnets, and suggests a possible further piece of evidence that Chapman was the rival poet. I do not find myself in agreement, however, with some of his detailed interpretations of individual sonnets, and I do not follow the argument about Shakespeare's senile garrulity before he was forty years old (p. 98).

C. J. Sisson.

To the Folger Shakespeare Library and to the learning and editorial skill of Professor J. Quincy Adams we owe an excellent collotype facsimile of the unique 1594 Quarto of *Titus Andronicus* in that library (*Shakespeare's Titus Andronicus, the first Quarto 1594. Folger Shakespeare Literary Publications*. New York and London: Scribners. 1936. 42 pp. + sigs. A 1-K 4 in facsimile), together with an admirable and full introduction in which all relevant information is gathered, and all the problems of bibliographical interest are discussed. The reproduction is extremely well done, and Professor Adams is careful to indicate occasional places where the process of reproduction may mislead with respect to certain minutiae, as is inevitable. But there has been no editorial sophistication of the process. The material is now available for further study of the play, and it is clear that the 'accepted' text needs revision in the light of this Quarto, in some important respects, and that later Quarto and Folio texts derived directly or indirectly from a damaged and incomplete copy of the First Quarto. Professor Adams has an interesting and convincing explanation to offer of the Peacham manuscript in the Longleat Library, and a new suggestion about a possible source of the play. And the history of the Folger Quarto is traced back as far as possible, to the eighteenth century.

The publication is of the highest scholarly interest, as well as of general interest. It is clear, by the way, that the 1594 Quarto was no credit to its printer John Danter. The inking was atrocious, the tone uneven, and the type often damaged, with a good deal of carelessness or shortage of sorts, e.g. r on sigs. c 3 and c 4. One would have welcomed details about the paper, in the editor's description of the Quarto.

C. J. Sisson.

In his *The Janus of Poets* (Cambridge: University Press. 1935. xii+164 pp. 5s.) Mr R. David makes out a convincing case against Jonson's dictum that Shakespeare wanted art. He traces Shakespeare's progress from the early lyrical drama through a rhetorical period to his perfecting of the instrument of dramatic poetry. He concludes with a most interesting section on Shakespeare's use of prose, the couplet and bombast. There are many good things in this book; it is, in spite of an occasional straining of the evidence in the section on bombast, a valuable contribution to Shakespearian studies.

More attention, however, to the formal study of rhetoric in the

Elizabethan age would perhaps have cast another light on the extract quoted on p. 8, and would have added weight to the statements on p. 36. Further, it would have helped to show a closer relationship between the early plays and the 'transition' plays. The value of colloquial prose in shaping Shakespeare's staple verse is not sufficiently stressed, and in the same connexion the similarity between Falstaff's prose and that of the seventeenth-century divines (p. 40) has implications that demand further analysis.

The punctuation of the quotations on pp. 49 and 61 does not agree.

J. H. WALTER.

Macbeth, a New Interpretation of the Text, by W. D. Sargeant (London: Heath Cranton. 1937. 208 pp. 7s. 6d.), follows the unusual method of interlarding the text every few lines with remarks and whole paragraphs of comment. This gives the volume the arrangement neither of an edition nor of a monograph: one cannot read the play as such, nor yet does the book give an integrated and coherent analysis of plot, character or theme. Indeed, one wishes that the author had at least added an essay setting forth his interpretation of the tragedy as a whole. The comments are usually ingenious and sometimes original and happy; but one wishes that they revealed a more technical knowledge of textual editing—such tests of emendation, for example, as a knowledge of Elizabethan palæography and printing would supply. One sometimes even wonders whether Schmidt and the *N.E.D.* were called into use. Too much of the interpretation seems based on mere inference: does Shakespeare portray Duncan as showing 'royal negligence' (p. 14, etc.)? or Banquo as 'extremely blameworthy' for not having the witches legally prosecuted (p. 42)? or Cawdor as no traitor, but merely the victim of a false charge trumped up by Ross and other nobles (pp. 24 *et seq.*, 43–44)?

J. W. DRAPER.

In *William Shenstone: A Chapter in Eighteenth-Century Taste* (Birmingham: Cornish Brothers. 1935. vi+152 pp. 6s.) Miss Marjorie Williams has made an interesting and adequate study of the life and temperament of an underrated early sentimentalist of the eighteenth century, and has 'embellished' her book with photographs (of the Leasowes, for example) and reproductions showing Shenstone's pretty mastery of calligraphy. She intends to follow up the present study by an edition of the letters. Perhaps it may not be too late to ask her to consider a change in her method of presenting the readings of Shenstone's MS. Shenstone had a way of indicating italic in his MS. by scoring a line under the word he wished to italicize, but scoring that line under only part of the word. Miss Williams in her present work has transcribed these partly underlined words *literatim*: for instance, one reads (p. 77) 'a Bird that has both *spirit and Elegance* in his Notes'. Until the reader understands the system of transcription, he is at a loss, and after discovering method in what looked like madness, he still finds it both ugly and pedantic. The main reason against it is that it makes complication where

nothing complicated was intended. One hopes that Miss Williams in her edition (which she gives evidence of being able to make definitive) will notify the reader of this idiosyncrasy in the manuscripts, and then in her text use italics and romans so as to represent Shenstone's intentions.

G. TILLOTSON.

Dr Heinz Ronte's rather solemn thesis (*Richardson und Fielding; Geschichte ihres Ruhms. Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten*. Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz. 1935. 217 pp.) starts with the characteristic sentence 'Alle Geschichte ist Wandlung ewigen Weltstoffs'. The thesis in brief is that Richardson's fame and story derive from the Bible, Fielding's from heathen myth. We had all known before that Richardson's pious middle-class origins are often painfully reflected in his novels, whereas Fielding wrote of society as he found it and wrote as a gentleman. Dr Ronte sees this difference of outlook as the eternal conflict between 'Christliches Bibeltum' and 'heidnisches Welttum', and in the first of the two parts of his study he develops the thesis with rather laborious ingenuity. Richardson is the preacher and Fielding the artist; Richardson thinks of the community (the family being the all-important cell), Fielding thinks of society; Richardson envisages the new world of commercial magnates, Fielding is positively feudal—indeed we are not surprised to learn that 'Wie der Minnesänger, der höfische Skalde und Skop, fragt er um Lohn und Sold'.

Nevertheless, the reader, who can allow for the author's too zealous prosecution of his main thesis, will find a good deal to reward him here. For one thing the difference between the twin fathers of the novel, expressed here at its starkest, was at all points fundamental and did correspond to a cleavage in society which always exists, but which was then at its widest. For another, Dr Ronte has collected all the relevant places which throw light on that cleavage.

The second part, which is a collection of opinions on the two writers down to modern times, would have been more valuable if the author had shown some sense of proportion in the selection. As it is, Coleridge and Mrs Opie are apparently of the same critical weight for Dr Ronte. One thing he makes clear, however, the parsons and the women right down were for Richardson, society and the Romantic critics for Fielding. A useful book of reference.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

A Bibliography of Edwin Arlington Robinson, by Charles Beecher Hogan (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. xiii + 221 pp. 34s.). This welcome bibliography of E. A. Robinson (1869–1935) is 'intended primarily for collectors'. Consequently it gives with meticulous care information about title-pages and original bindings as well as collations of first editions, numbers of copies, prices and dates of publication. Of particular interest are the lists of 'Books and Pamphlets originally publishing work by Robinson' and of 'Work originally published in Periodicals and Newspapers'. They show Robinson's limited

range of literary associations, which were confined, in the main, to New England and New York. Some of the fugitive pieces here mentioned are reprinted in Part v, the most noteworthy of them being a blank verse rendering of *Aeneid*, book v, ll. 104-285 (*The Galley Race*). Less satisfactory from the point of view of the literary historian seems to me Part iv, 'Biographical and Critical Material'. It is to be regretted that the number of pages is not given here in all instances; yet it is of importance to know at a glance, e.g., that B. R. Redman's study (1926) contains 96 pages of text, and Cestre's *Introduction* (1930) 230 pages. And one would like to know something of the size and importance of the Robinson-Bibliography of L. Beebe and R. J. Bulkley, Jr. (1931). Some reviews of such critical books are listed on pp. 125-35; but this list is by no means complete as far as European periodicals are concerned.

W. FISCHER.

In *From Richardson to Pinero* (London: John Murray. 1936. v+280 pp. 8s. 6d.) are gathered into one volume ten essays by Professor F. S. Boas, each concerned with some important turning-point or innovation in the history of English literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Some have already been published, but are out of print; others are published for the first time. The older material, revised and re-written, consists of studies of Richardson, Wordsworth the patriotic poet, Tennyson and Arthurian legend, Hallam, Arnold the lyric poet, Thackeray and his Humorist heroes, and Browning's *Paracelsus*. The studies hitherto unpublished deal with Kean in his fortunes and innovations in the acting of heroic parts, with the poetry of Mrs Browning, and with Pinero.

Some of the papers are more comprehensive than others, but the same crystal-clear presentation of material is common to all. It is good to have the study of Richardson's strength and skill made more widely available. His real importance as an innovator, and the sensitive art which launched the novel, are analysed with a touch as sure as that which reveals his limitations. There is a certain staginess about the Wordsworth essay, yet no one can deny its truth, though it may be a truth more easily acceptable at a time of national sickness. The new material is all good, clear in statement, clean in judgment. The essay on Pinero is as good an introduction to the dramatist as one can need, firm, orderly, perceptive and sane. That on Kean is a sympathetic study of a strange star actor. In the examination of the poetry and thought of Elizabeth Barrett Browning a plea is made for the closer study of her early poetry. Soundness, sanity and control mark them all.

W. D. THOMAS.

In his lectures delivered at the Sorbonne and published as *Le Roman de Flamenca* (Bibliothèque de la Revue des Cours et Conférences. Paris: Boivin. 1936. 77 pp. 8 fr.) Professor Georges Millardet has not set out to establish new identifications or to re-examine the questions of date and authorship or to find fresh sources. Upon these questions he has,

in the main, been content to summarize briefly the results obtained by other scholars and to maintain an attitude of benevolent neutrality or rather of judicious and gentle scepticism. For him it is enough that *Flamenca* was composed in the thirteenth century and that the author was well versed in scholastic philosophy and in the polite literature of his time. He is concerned with the literary analysis and appreciation of *Flamenca*, its portrayal of manners and customs (ch. II), its interpretation of the theory and practice of courtly love (ch. III), and its claim to be considered a 'roman de jalousie' quite as much as a 'roman d'amour' (ch. IV). It is in this last chapter that Professor Millardet brings out most clearly the exceptional literary gifts of the author, his acute observation, his careful selection of the most telling external manifestations of Archambaut's jealousy, and above all his craftsmanship. Viewed from this new angle, *Flamenca* is seen to begin as a comedy, to move towards an Othello-like tragedy, and then brusquely, by the rather artificial device of the Ambiguous Oath and a fabliau-nouvelle type of intrigue, towards tragi-comedy.

These very readable lectures may be said to have fulfilled amply the object of revealing the high qualities of *Flamenca* to a wider public and of justifying the lecturer's description of it as 'une des œuvres du moyen âge les plus attrayantes, les plus riches en réalités précises, d'une valeur humaine en même temps que pittoresquement locale'. Their usefulness is enhanced by a carefully compiled bibliography.

A. EWERT.

The best characteristic of Herr Max Krüger's *Die Entwicklung und Bedeutung des Nonnenklosters Port-Royal im 17. Jahrhundert* (1609-1709) (Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. 15 M.) is its convenience. There is a Bibliography of over 500 works useful to the student of Jansenism; the short sections into which the author has divided his book are clearly subheaded and logically arranged; misprints are comparatively few (and, for the most part, not seriously misleading, e.g. 'Urban XIII' for 'Urban VIII' on p. 144). It is disappointing that the author has been content throughout to quote from familiar contemporary and modern authorities; and still more so, that he has often accepted uncritically testimony which is conspicuously partial. For example, he quotes clerical diatribes to prove a state of widespread immorality in society (pp. 8-9, etc.); his account of the work of Zamet at Port-Royal is based solely on the writings of Mère Angélique and her admirers (pp. 131-6); he takes (apparently) from Augustin Gazier the astounding statement (p. 311) that Nicole's *Essais de Morale* and the *Pensées* of Pascal (neither of which was published before 1670) influenced the pessimistic *Maximes* of La Rochefoucauld. Some unfortunate omissions may be noted. The author has made no use of the recently published *Journal* of Baudry de Saint-Gilles, which throws much light on the relations of the French Jansenists with de Retz. He writes: 'Die ersten Schritte gegen dieses Kloster wurden... von der Geistlichkeit unternommen' (p. 149)—apparently in ignorance of

Richelieu's *démarche* at Rome in 1633. His only allusion to any influence of Papal politics on the course of Jansenist affairs is in the single sentence: 'Vom Jahre 1673 an standen die Jansenisten auf der Seite des Papstes gegen den König' (p. 186). The most interesting part of the book is the account of life in and about Port-Royal. The ethos of the convent itself is sympathetically analysed; idealistic portraits of three nuns and four solitaries are collected from contemporary testimony; the educational technique and ideals of the Jansenists are clearly described, and there are useful analyses of the *Logique* and the *Grammaire*.

NIGEL ABERCROMBIE.

Professor F. C. Green and the Cambridge University Press can claim the gratitude of the university students of French Literature for collecting and printing *Diderot's Writings on the Theatre* (1936. 317 pp. 7s. 6d.), which have not been easily accessible, except either in Assézat et Tourneux, or, piecemeal, in different selections of Diderot's writings. A short biographical sketch precedes: next *Entretiens sur le Fils Naturel*, with a summary of the play; *De la Poésie dramatique*, the *Lettre à Mme Riccoboni*; chapter xxxviii of *Les Bijoux Indiscrets*; *Garrick ou les Acteurs anglais*; extracts from *Lettres à Mlle Jodin*; and *Le Paradoxe sur le Comédien*. It is not easy to see why Professor Green claims to follow the chronological order (Foreword), since this is departed from both in the theory of the theatre and the theory on acting. Naturally Diderot's translations (*Beverley*, etc.), his projected plays and his *comptes-rendus* of current pieces are omitted (Assézat, vol. viii). I confess, however, to a slight regret that the compiler could not have persuaded the Cambridge Press to swell the volume by including *Le Fils Naturel*, only accessible in Assézat, with perhaps also the *Père de Famille* and the entertaining *Est-il Bon? Est-il Méchant?* But this is mere greed, and admittedly it is Diderot's theory, rather than his practice, which matters. It might have been useful to refer the various selections to their source in the edition of Assézat.

H. J. HUNT.

With much patience and erudition Mr Michele de Filippis has ascertained the sources of some ninety of the anecdotes that Manso ascribed to Tasso (*Anecdotes in Manso's 'Vita di Tasso'*, in *Publications in Modern Philology*, University of California Press, vol. xviii, No. 6, pp. 443-502, 1936), and he shows that they are mainly to be traced to the *Apophthegmata* of Erasmus, L. Guicciardini's *L'Hore di recreatione*, L. Domenichi's *Facezie*, and the *Floresta Española* of Santa Cruz de Dueñas. Manso was so well read in ancient literature that he might well himself have drawn his anecdotes direct from the classics: granting that he added these anecdotes to embellish his work, one could scarcely wish for a safer guide to his sources; but there is a preliminary question that the author did not feel called upon to discuss. Would Manso have dealt so cavalierly with the hero of a life he seems to have taken twenty years to write? If Manso was learned, Tasso himself was a man of very wide reading;

what then if Tasso had on occasion repeated a witty reply that he had read in Erasmus or elsewhere? After all, the first editions of Erasmus, Guicciardini and Domenichi date respectively from 1551, 1583 and 1566, if the Spanish *Floresta* appeared later. Manso, having observed that Tasso was at times affected by intellectual 'psittachosis', and having discovered some of his sources, may have added more anecdotes, but he would scarcely have chosen this line without some provocation. Ultimately we are interested in Tasso's life, rather than in the work of Manso, or at least in the latter in so far as it may help us to a better understanding of the poet; and thus this piece of research will only become of value if, and when, it be proved that this feature of Tasso's personality was a fabrication of Manso's.

C. FOLIGNO.

As it appears from the dates limiting A. Tortoreto and J. G. Fucilla's *Bibliografia analitica tassiana* (1896-1930) (Milan: Balaffio. 1935. xviii + 167 pp. L. 12) its principal aim is to supply the extant bibliographical information on Tasso studies from 1896 to 1930; thus providing a continuation to the standard works on the subject, which do not go beyond 1896 *circa*, and co-ordinating the results of later special research. In addition to this an essential bibliography is given in the preface, covering the period 1930-5. The authors have given us yet another valuable and necessary contribution to the study of the Italian poet. Since, independently of one another, they had already dealt with the same subject in previous publications (1931-3) it was to be hoped that by joining forces they would produce a piece of work as accurate and complete as bibliographies should be. In fact their praiseworthy attempt at completeness makes the long list of additions welcome; but it is unfortunate that the revision of the proofs was so lax and the accuracy of the printers so faulty as to require a list of 'Corrigenda', which in its turn is not exhaustive. (On p. xv, l. 28, the *Kölnische Zeitung* is not entered in alphabetical order in the list of periodicals; the following are not to be found in the index: R. H. W., p. 122, l. 18; A. C. M., p. 124, l. 12; on p. 137, l. 18, a wrong reference number is given after D. M. M.; on p. 160 (index) a wrong reference number is given to T. Salvini; misprints may be observed on p. ix, l. 25; p. 82, l. 6; p. 131, l. 28; p. 132, l. 14; anonymous works are in no way classified.) This is no carping criticism, for the book is well planned and of considerable use (it comprises upwards of 930 entries) and in its cheap presentation would have met with unstinted praise from all students of Tasso.

A. UNGARO.

Don Pedro Henríquez Ureña's *La Cultura y las letras coloniales en Santo Domingo* (Universidad de Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filología; Oxford: Blackwell. 1936. 191 pp. 3s. 9d.) is a remarkable book, and not easy to classify. He has already written on *Literatura dominicana: estudio sobre la época colonial* (extracted from the *Revue Hispanique*, Paris, 1917) and on *El idioma español en Santo Domingo* (Univ. de Buenos Aires). What he has now to display is the contents of his note-

books. The text covers the records of the discoverers, the universities (two!), the activities of bishops, clerics and laymen, and the effects of depopulation, emigration and insurrection. Supporting the text are voluminous notes on each of the authors cited. There seems to be nothing Sr Henríquez Ureña does not know on his subject, obscure as it is to most scholars, and in these notes one finds the strangest ramifications of information. The whole is, therefore, a source-book of uncommon interest concerning an 'ambiente saturado de letras', as the colony was at first, followed by a certain languor, despite which there remained intellectual life enough to stimulate Cuba and Venezuela to unwonted vigour. Historians who estimate the consequences in intellectual decline of Spanish government or the Inquisition or any of the other well-known Aunt Sallies of our text-books, could employ a profitable hour following up the implications of any of the author's notes. The book stands open by chance at a note on Cristóbal de Llerena, who could be described in 1576 as 'muy buen latino, músico de tecla y voz, virtuoso y hombre de bien'; he was a canon and organist in the Cathedral, and humanist and rector in the University of Gorjón. That was sixty years before the foundation of Harvard.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

Dedicated to Rudolf Much by his pupil Dr Siegfried Gutenbrunner, *Die germanischen Götternamen der antiken Inschriften (Rheinische Beitr. und Hilfsbücher zur germ. Phil. und Volkskunde, 24. Halle: Niemeyer. 1936. viii + 260 pp. 3 M.)* is a worthy contribution to the study of a recondite domain which Much did much to clarify. The author is well aware of the complexities of his task, e.g. the significance of the 'interpretatio Romana' and the discrimination between Celtic and Germanic elements, and never puts forward as established that which is merely an acceptable hypothesis. He does, however, fully justify his claim that by a strict adherence to philological method and by taking account of the historical and geographical factors it is possible not only to produce interpretations of a high degree of cogency, but also to provide welcome material for the elucidation of linguistic problems in Germanic and especially in West Germanic. With this in view he does not shrink from participating in the controversy regarding the origin of the name *Germani* (in connexion with *Garmangabis*) and he gives on pp. 14 ff. a most useful summary of the phonetic features exhibited by the inscriptions of different dates. The names treated occur on the monuments connected with the military camps of the Middle and Lower Rhine or with Hadrian's wall (at which many legionaries of the Lower Rhine were stationed). They include those of gods and their epithets (e.g. *Mars Thingsus*), goddesses like *Nerthus*, *Nehalennia*, the war-goddess *Harimella* and the *Alaesiagae Beda* and *Fimmilena*, in connexion with whom the author inserts a lucid discussion on the Frisian law-terms *bodþing*, **bedþing* and *fmelþing*. Of special interest and importance is the long section on the 'Matres' and 'Matronae', in which parallels from Celtic and Germanic (*mōdranikt*, *Disablōt*, *landdīsir*, etc.) are adduced. On the basis of the inscription

Aufanis Matronis et Matribus in contrast with another inscription in which *sive* connects the two words, the author attempts to distinguish the terms, referring us in regard to 'Matres' to the corn-mother and the regional or national deities and in regard to the 'Matronae' to their function in child-birth. The 'Matronae' on the monuments are three female figures of which the central one is young and without a head-dress, whereas her companions wear wide-brimmed hats like the Swiss 'Hinderfür' of older days. Their names raise some intricate problems, e.g. the analysis of the endings *-e(i)h(i)ae*, *-inehae* and *-henae*. A map shows how the various matron-names are distributed in six different regions (Cologne, Bonn, Lower Erft and Upper Niers, Jülich, Züllich, Billing and Marmagen). The work concludes with the text of all the inscriptions containing divine names, a selection of admirably reproduced illustrations of monuments containing inscriptions, an extensive bibliography and two indexes. It is certainly indispensable in the equipment of those studying Germanic problems.

W. E. COLLINSON.

It is certain that with his *Kleine deutsche Literaturgeschichte* (Copenhagen: Gyldendalsche Boghandel Nordisk Forlag. 1936) Professor Carl Røos had not intended to write the new History of German Literature which is desired by all students of 'Germanistik' in every country. Even he, the Dane, who knows well how to say a great deal in a few German words, would not be able to carry out such a task in scarcely 120 pages. It is, however, for the student that his book is of considerable value. It not only provokes new ideas, but it also induces the student to ask questions, i.e. to rely on his own understanding and to think for himself. This point is of great merit, especially at a time when the student is so often educated in a way that leads him to regard his teacher as a mere crammer. Doubtless an active student might be the best reviewer of this book—and he will certainly consider its author an active professor. Nothing is easier than to supplement a book written with such concentration. The present reviewer restricts himself, therefore, to the remark that he does not understand why the author calls the third part: 'Die Goethe-Zeit oder die deutsche Bewegung'. The second part, from Luther to Lessing, has the excellent heading: 'Vom Humanismus bis zur Humanität'. Why then not call the third: 'Humanität' and the fourth: 'Von der Humanität zum Nationalismus', instead of 'Bewegungs-Literatur', which is Greek to everybody. As regards style and content it will be necessary to revise the chapter dealing with Kleist in a second edition and to find for W. Raabe the small place which is refused to him in this edition.

A. M. WAGNER.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

April—June 1937

With the collaboration of MARY S. SERJEANTSON (English),
A. T. HATTO and F. NORMAN (German)

GENERAL

- BAUD-BOVY, S., *La Chanson populaire grecque du Dodécanèse*, i, Les textes. Paris, Belles Lettres. 75 fr.
- Bibliographie Balkanique, 1936. Paris, Soc. Gén. d'Imprimerie et d'Édition. 60 fr.
- BRAUN, M., Kosovo. Die Schlacht auf d. Amselfelde in geschichtlicher und epischer Überlieferung. (Slav.-Balt. Quellen, 8.) Leipzig, Markert und Vettors. 4 M. 50.
- BRÜCKNER, A. (ed.), *Encyklopedia Staropolska*. Warsaw (Krakowskie Przedmieście, 13), Trzaski, Evert, i Michaelski. Subscription zł. 6.50 per part for about 15 monthly parts.
- CASTLE, E., and others, *Orazio nella letteratura mondiale*. Rome, Istituto di Studi Romani. 6s.
- Enciclopedia Italiana*, XXXII: SOD-SVO. Rome, Istituto della Enciclopedia.
- GUARNIERI, S., *Il Costume letterario*. Florence, Parenti. L. 10.
- JABERG. Festschrift Karl Jaberg zum 60 Geb. gewidmet (ZRP, LVII, 1937, 2/4).
- KOZÁKY, J., *Geschichte der Totentänze*, I (Bibliotheca Humanitatis Historica, I). Budapest, Stemmer. Pengo 40.
- LEOTTI, A., *Dizionario albanese-italiano*. Rome, Ist. per l' Europa Orientale. L. 120.
- LOMBARDO, L., *Introduzione allo Stato nel Rinascimento*. Palermo, Sandron. L. 7.
- NEUMANN, F. W., *Geschichte der russischen Ballade* (Schriften d. Albertus- Univ.). Königsberg, Ost-Europa Verl. 11 M. 50.
- PUSHKIN. Centennial Essays for Pushkin, ed. by S. H. Cross and E. J. Simmons. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 10s. 6d.
- SIMMONS, E. J., *Pushkin*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 18s.
- URBANI, U., *Scrittori jugoslavi: riflessi d' Italia su scrittori serbo-croati-sloveni*. Zara, E. De Schönfeld. L. 15.
- VAN GINNEKEN. *Mélanges de Linguistique et de Philologie, offerts à J. van Ginneken*. Amsterdam, Swets en Zeitlinger. 75 Fr. fr.
- Vers un nouvel Humanisme (Entretien)*. Paris, Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle. 30 fr.
- WŁK, N. J. VAN, *L'Origine de la Langue polonaise commune* (Kon. Akad. v. Wetenschappen). Amsterdam. 2s.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- HEISS, H., *Die romanischen Literaturen des 19. und 20. Jh., II, 3* (Hdb. d. Litwiss., Lfg. 206). Potsdam, Athenaion. 1 M. 95.
- WINKLER, E. G., *Gestalten und Probleme* (Giono, Claudel, Romains, Montherlant, Valéry, Lope de Vega, Proust, Spanische Barocklyrik). Leipzig, Rauch.

Mediaeval Latin.

- FISCHER, H.-W., Untersuchungen über die Quellen der Rhetorik des Martianus Capella. Diss. Breslau.
 INGUANEZ, D. M., Un Dramma della Passione nel sec. XII. Badia di Montecassino.
 MAY, F., De Sermone Martiani Capellæ: quæstiones selectæ. Diss. Marburg.

Italian.

- AKAR, Les Lauriers de Pétrarque. Paris, Figuière. 12 fr.
 ALFIERI, V., La Vita, ed. M. Lombardo-Lotti. Turin, Paravia. L. 10.
 ALFIERI, V., Oreste, ed. M. Lombardo-Lotti (Classici Italiani). Turin, Paravia. L. 4.
 ANTONELLI, L., Maschera nuda di Pirandello. Rome, Vettoriani. L. 6.
 ANTONIADE, C., Trois Figures de la Renaissance: l'Arétin, Guichardin, Benvenuto Cellini. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer. 20 fr.
 ARRIGHI, P., Le Vérisme dans la prose narrative italienne. La Poésie vériste en Italie. Paris, Boivin. 80 and 40 fr.
 ASCARI, T., Vittorio Alfieri. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
 BALDI, E., e A. CERCHIARI, Enciclopedia moderna italiana. 2 vols. Milan, Sonzogno. L. 250.
 BARTOLOMEI, C., La Madre di Leopardi. Rome, Signorelli. L. 5.
 BATTAGLIA, F., Enea Silvio Piccolomini e Francesco Patrizi. Rome, Olshki. L. 30.
 BERCHET, G., Poesie, ed. G. Lazzeri (Classici italiani annotati). L. 25.
 BOIARDO, M., Tutte le Opere, II, ed. A. Zottoli (Classici). Milan, Mondadori. L. 45.
 Busetto, A., Marinetti poeta, animatore e combattente della vigilia. Milan, Mare Nostro. L. 3.
 CALDERARO, G., Alessandro Manzoni e il mondo latino e greco. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 12.
 CASTELLI, A., Il Dissidio interiore di Francesco Petrarca. Rome, Signorelli. L. 5.
 CHICCO, A., Alceo e Saffo nella poesia di Giosuè Carducci. Trieste, Trani. L. 2.50.
 CROCE, B., Giosuè Carducci. 3rd ed. (Bibl. di Cultura Moderna.) Bari, Laterza. L. 8.50.
 DAMIANI, E., Il Senso del teatro pirandelliano. Rome, Rivista Italo-Bulgara. L. 5.
 DANTE, Il Convivio, ed. G. Busnelli e G. Vandelli. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 120.
 DI LEO, E., Scienza e umanesimo in Gerolamo Fracastoro. Salerno, Spadafora. L. 10.
 DOLCI, G., Foscolo. Messina, Principato. L. 20.
 DOMINO, I., Antologia degli scrittori umbri. Florence, All'Insegna del Libro. L. 6.
 EVOLA, J., Il Mistero del Graal e la tradizione ghibellina dell'Impero. 4s. 6d.
 FABIETTI, E., Storia d'Italia dalle origini ai nostri giorni. Milan, Genio. L. 70.
 FINCO, S., Gino Ghidoni. Gravina di Puglia, Sorrisi d'Arte. L. 2.
 FRENZEL, H., Alfredo Oriani, 1852-1909 (Ital. Stud., 3). Cologne, Petrarca-Haus. 3 M. 60.
 GIRARDINI, E., La Poesia carducciana. Udine, Ist. delle Ediz. Accademiche. L. 8.
 GOVONI, C., Splendori della poesia italiana dalle origini ai nostri giorni. Milan, Hoepli. L. 20.
 GUARNIERI, S., Saggio su D'Annunzio. Florence, Parenti. L. 10.
 LAREDO DE MENDOZA, S., Gabriele D'Annunzio, marinaio e aviatore navale. Milan, Impresa Edit. Italiana. L. 20.

- MAGI, E., *La Dafne ovvero La Verginità trionfante*. Rome, R. Deputazione per la Storia di Malta. L. 10.
- MATTALIA, D., *Carducci poeta*. Messina, Principato. L. 12.
- MIELI, G., *Chi è Beatrice? Saggio critico di Vita Nuova*. Rome, Signorelli. L. 14.
- Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft, ed. W. Goetz, i. Weimar, Bohlau.
- NICODEMI, E., *Masceo Cavalcante nel Poema Sacro*. Rome, Dante Alighieri. L. 5.
- NICOLINI, F., *Peste e Untori nei Promessi Sposi e nella realtà storica (Bibl. di Cultura Moderna)*. Bari, Laterza. L. 25.
- OPALKA, B., *Dante und die politischen Mächte seiner Zeit: Untersuchungen zur Monarchie*. Diss. Berlin, Ebering.
- ORESTANO, F., *L'Opera letteraria di Benedetta*. Rome, Ediz. Futuriste di Poesia.
- PALMAROCCHI, R., *I Villani: Giovanni, Matteo e Filippo Villani—sec. XIV (Scrittori italiani)*. Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- PAPINI, G., *Storia della Letteratura italiana, I: Duecento e Trecento*. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 15.
- PERITORE, G. A., *La Poesia del Carducci*. Modena, Tip. Modenese. L. 10.
- PORTIER, LUCIENNE, *Antonio Fogazzaro*. Paris, Boivin. 60 fr.
- RIESZKOWSKI, B., *Studi sul Platonismo del Rinascimento in Italia (Univ. di Roma)*. Florence, Sansoni. L. 30.
- ROCCO, C., *Letterati napoletani nel quadro delle celebrazioni campane*. Rome, Luzzati.
- ROSINA, T., *Ceccardo Roccatagliata Ceccardi*. Genoa, Emiliano degli Orfini. L. 15.
- SCHILLIRÒ, V., *Come vedo Pirandello*. 2 ed. Turin, SEI. L. 7.
- SCIORTINO, G., *Esperienze antidannunziane*. 2 ed. Palermo, Sandron. L. 7.
- Scrittori cattolici italiani del '900*, ed. G. Sala. Lanciano, Carabba. L. 5.
- STRACHEY, MARJORIE, Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour. London, Hogarth Press. 1s. 6d.
- TILGHER, A., *Antologia dei filosofi italiani del dopo-guerra*. Modena, Guanda. L. 10.
- VANNUCCI, P., *Carducci e gli Scolopi*. Rome, Signorelli. L. 7.50.
- VERRUA, N., *Il Pensiero filosofico di Pantaleo Carabellese*. Bobbio, Repetti Mozzi. L. 8.
- VIVIANI, A., *Papini aneddotico*. Rome, Formiggini. L. 9.
- VOSSLER, K., *Lingua e nazione in Italia e in Germania*. Florence, Sansoni. L. 3.
- WALSER, W., *Zur Charakteristik der Mundart des Aosta-Tales*. Diss. Aarau, Sauerländer.
- ZIINO, M., *Pause manzoniane*, 2a serie. Palermo, presso l'autore. L. 7.
- ZOTTI, P., *Santo Francesco e Madonna Povertà (Paradiso XI)*. Benevento, Le Forche Caudine. L. 5.

Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- DE LA RIVA-AGUIERO, Lope de Vega. Milan, Treves. L. 6.
- DORIA, G., *Storia dell'America Latina (Argentina-Brasile)*. Milan, Hoepli. L. 15.
- DORIAN, M. et F. DE VAUX DE FOLETIER, *Le Comte de Buenos-Aires*. Paris, NRF. 12 fr.
- Europe-Amérique Latine (Entretien). Paris, Institut International de Coopération Intellectuelle. 30 fr.
- GIESE, W., *Nordost-Cádiz: ein kulturwiss. Beitrag zur Erforschung Andalusiens*. (Beitr. zur ZRP, 89.) Halle, Niemeyer. 12 M. 80.
- GREGOR, H., *Das spanische Welttheater*. Vienna, Reichner. 8 M. 50.

- KLAIBER, L., Katalonien in der deutschen Wissenschaft (Spanische Forschungen d. Gorresges., I, 6). Munster, Aschendorff.
- LAPA, M. RODRIGUES, Uma versão desconhecida da Iª *Soledad* de Góngora (Extr. *Boletim de Filologia*, III, 3). Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional.
- LAUWE, J. DE, L'Amérique ibérique. Paris, NRF. 18 fr.
- PARROT, L., Panorama de la Culture Espagnole. Paris, ESI. 12 fr.
- ROSE, J. H., Was the Failure of the Spanish Armada due to Storms? (British Academy). Oxford Univ. Press. 3s.
- SCHULTZ, H., Das modale Satzgefüge im Altspanischen (Berliner Beiträge, VII, 1). Jena, Gronau. 3 M. 50.
- VOIGT, P., Die Sierra Nevada. Haus—Hausrat—Hausliches und gewerbliches Tagewerk. (Stud. z. VKR, 23.) Hamburg, Evert. 5 M.
- WELLMAN, ESTHER T., Amado Nervo. New York, Instituto de las Españas.

Portuguese.

- LUCIEN-GRAUX, Dr, Le Portugal économique. Paris, Chiron. 35 fr.
- SAMPAYO RIBEIRO, MARCO DE, As guitarras de Alcacér. Lisbon, Arquivo Histórico de Portugal.
- Vijayanagara Sexcentenary Volume. Dharwar, Vijayanagara Empire Sexcentenary Association.

French, Provençal.

(a) General (including Linguistic).

- Bibliographie des cours de Littérature française 1936-38. Paris, Droz. 6 fr.
- CHARLES-BRUN, Qu'est-ce que c'est le régionalisme? Paris, Flory. 2 fr.
- FORMONT, M., et A. LEMERRE, Le Vers français. Paris, Lemerre. 15 fr.
- GRAMMONT, M., Le Vers français. Paris, Delagrave. 60 fr.
- HARTMANN, K., Ein Beitrag zur Palatalentwicklung und zur Dialektologie des Altfranzösischen. Diss. Ellrich (Südharz), Krause.
- MIEGÉ, MADELEINE, Le Français dialectal de Lyon. Lyon, Masson. 25 fr.
- RUNKIEWITZ, W., Der Wortschatz der Grafschaft Rethel in Beziehung zur modernen Mundart nach dem 'Trésor des Chartes du Comté de Rethel' (Leipziger romanist. Studien, I, 16). Leipzig, Noske. 9 M.

(b) Old French.

- CHARTIER, ALAIN, La Belle Dame sans Merci, ed. A. Pagès. Paris, Droz. 16 fr.
- CHASTEL, G., Bayard. Paris, Lanore. 10 fr.
- COVILLE, A., Le petit Jehan de Saintré. Paris, Droz. 15 fr.
- DROZ, EUGÈNE, Le Manuscrit des Plaintes d'Acante de Tristan l'Hermite. Paris, Droz. 24 fr.
- DUPONT, J., Les Primitifs français. Paris, Plon. 18 fr.
- Fet des romains, Li, ed. L. F. Flutre et K. Sneyders de Vogel, I; texte critique. Paris, Droz. 80 fr.
- FRAPPIER, J., La Mort le Roi Artu: roman du XVII siècle. Étude sur la Mort le Roi Artu. Paris, Droz. 40 and 60 fr.
- JAKEMÉ, Le Roman du Castelain de Couci et de la Dame de Fayel, ed. M. Delbouille (after J. E. Matzke) (SATF). Paris, Droz. 40 fr.
- KONIGER, HERTHA, Die Darstellung der Personen bei Chrétien de Troyes. Diss. Munich, Mössl.
- LINSKILL, J., Saint Léger. Étude de la langue du manuscrit de Clermont-Ferrand. Paris, Droz.
- MAUCOLLE, J., Doon de Mayence. Paris, Lanore. 12 fr.

- MOLINET, J., *Les Faicts et Dits*, ed. N. Dupire, 1 (SATF). Paris, Droz. 40 fr.
 VAN WAAARD, R., *Études sur l'origine et la formation de la Chanson d'Aspremont*. Groningen, Wolters.
 WIRZ, WILHELMINE (ed.), *Flore et Blanche-flor*, nach d. Pariser HS 375 (A) mit Glossar (Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen, 15). Frankfurt am Main, Diesterweg. 6 M.

(c) *Modern French.*

- ALAIN, *Avec Balzac*. Paris, NRF. 33 fr.
 ANAS, *L'Esprit d'Henry Becque*. Paris, NRF. 6 fr.
 ANGELI, A., *Il Dio degli Atei: Ernesto Renan, Anatole France, Giorgio Clemenceau*. Turin, SEI. L. 6.
 Anthologie des Poètes français: XIX^e siècle à nos jours. Paris, Lemerre. 25 fr.
 ARMAND, F., et R. MAUBLANC, Fourier. Paris, ESI. 25 fr.
 BALZAC, *Comédie humaine*, IX, X (Pléiade). Paris, NRF. 68 fr.
 BARRIÈRE, P., *Les Rimes de Pierre de Laval (1576)*. Bordeaux, Delmas. 35 fr.
 G. BAUER, *Les Billets de Guermantes*. Paris, Plon. 18 fr.
 BÉGUIN, A., *L'Âme romantique et le rêve, essai sur le romantisme allemand et la poésie française*. 2 vols. Paris. 60 fr.
 BENDA, J., *Précision, 1930-37*. Paris, NRF. 45 fr.
 BEUCHAT, C., *Paul de Saint-Victor*. Paris, Perrin. 15 fr.
 BOILEAU, *Épistres*, ed. A. Cahen (STFM). Paris, Droz. 15 fr.
 BOLLERY, J., *Le Désespéré de Léon Bloy (Les Grands Événements Littéraires)*. Paris, Malfère. 18 fr.
 BONNEROT, J., *Bibliographie de l'œuvre de Sainte-Beuve*. Paris, Giraud-Badin. 80 fr.
 BRÜCKMANN, J., *Hugues Rebell (Studien zur abendland. Geistes- und Gesellschafts-Geschichte, 8)*. Bonn, Rohrscheid. 4 M.
 BRUNSHVIGG, L., *Descartes*. Paris, Rieder. 25 fr.
 BUCHNER, M. L., *A Contribution to the Study of the Descriptive Technique of J.-J. Rousseau*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$1.25.
 BUSSE, C. U., *Das regionalistische Programm bei Maurice Barrès*. Bochum, Pöppinghaus.
 CELLÈRES, A., *Victor Cherbuliez*. Paris, Droz. 50 fr.
 CELLES, J. DE, *Malherbe*. Paris, Perrin. 16 fr.
 CHAMPION, E., *La Comédie-Française, année 1936*. Paris, Stock. 100 fr.
 CHAPELAIN, J., *Opuscules critiques*, intro. A. C. Hunter (STFM). Paris, Droz. 50 fr.
 CHEVALIER, J., R. VERNEAUX, etc., *Autour du Discours de la Méthode*, XIII, II. Paris, Beauchesne. 45 fr.
 CITOLEUX, M., *Le vrai Montaigne*. Paris, Lethellieux. 20 fr.
 CUVILLIER, A., *Proudhon*. Paris, ESI. 15 fr.
 DARGAN, E. P., *Anatole France*. New York and London, Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.
 DAUS, Jacques Rivièr, *seine Geistesart und Beurteilung des deutschen Menschen*. Diss. Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M.
 DESCARTES, *Discours de la Méthode*. Paris, Cluny. 12 fr.
 DESCARTES, *Entretien avec Burman*, ed. Ch. Adam (Bibl. de la RLC). Paris, Boivin.
 DESCARTES, *Études sur Descartes (Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale)*. Paris. 30 fr.
 DESCARTES, *Œuvres et Lettres (Pléiade)*. Paris, NRF. 85 fr.

- DESCARTES, Les Passions de l'Âme, ed. P. Mesnard (Bibl. de la RLC). Paris, Boivin.
- DUFAY, P., Les Mœurs du XVIII^e siècle d'après les Mémoires du temps. Paris, Crès. 16 fr. 50.
- DUHAMEL, G., Défense des Lettres. Paris, Mercure de France. 15 fr.
- DUHAMEL, G., Textes choisis. Paris, Grasset. 27 fr.
- DUMAS, A., Poètes Nouveaux. Paris, Delagrave. 15 fr.
- DUMESNIL, R., L'Éducation sentimentale de Gustave Flaubert (1889) (Les Grands Événements Littéraires). Paris. 12 fr.
- D'URFÉ, HONORÉ, L'Astrée, ed. H. Vaganay. Lyon, Masson. 160 fr.
- EBERT, J., Maurice Barrès und die Rheinfrage. Diss. Bottrop, Postberg.
- ÉTIMBLE et GAUCLÈRE, Y., Rimbaud. Paris, NRF. 15 fr.
- FABUREAU, H., Paul Valéry. Paris, NRC. 15 fr.
- FELLOWS, O. E., French Opinion of Molière (1800-1850). Providence, Brown Univ.
- FEUILLERAT, A., Paul Bourget. Paris, Plon. 24 fr.
- Five French Farces, 1655-1694? A Critical Ed. by H. C. Lancaster. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$1.25.
- FLAUBERT, La Tentation de Saint Antoine—Trois Contes, ed. R. Tisserand. Paris, Larousse. 7 fr. 50.
- FONTAINE, A., Verlaine: homme de lettres. Documents inédits. Paris, Delagrave. 20 fr.
- FOSCA, F., Histoire et technique du roman policier. Paris, NRC. 15 fr.
- GARNIER, L., La Vie de Notre bon Jehan de la Fontaine. Paris, Deruelle. 60 fr.
- GÉRIN-RICARD, L. DE, Les Institutions Politiques de Fustel de Coulanges (Les Grands Événements Littéraires). Paris, Malfère. 12 fr.
- GIANTURCO, E., Joseph de Maistre and Giambattista Vico. New York, Columbia Univ.
- GOFFIN, R., Rimbaud vivant. Paris, Corrêa. 15 fr.
- GOHIN, F., La Fontaine. Paris, Garnier. 15 fr.
- GROSSHANS, K., Romain Rolland und der germanische Geist. Diss. Würzburg, Triltsch.
- HABICHT, R., Henri Bergson und das deutsche Typenlustspiel. Diss. Strassburg, Heitz.
- HENRY-ROZIER, MARGUERITE, Rouget de l'Isle. Paris, NRF. 35 fr.
- HEY, PAULA, Chateaubriand und Pascal (Stud. z. abendländ. Geistes- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte, 9). Bonn, Rohrscheid. 3 M. 80.
- HITZ, MARIA FEBRONIA, Die Redekunst in Bourdaloues Predigt. Diss. Munich, Huber.
- HOCKE, G. R., Lukrez in Frankreich von der Renaissance bis zur Revolution. Diss. Cologne, Kerschgens.
- ISELER, P., Les Débuts d'André Gide, vus par Pierre Louys. Paris, Sagittaire. 15 fr.
- ISTRATI, M. A., Victor Cherbuliez et le Cosmopolitisme. Paris, Droz. 30 fr.
- KARL, L., Jean Racine, Eine psychologische Charakterstudie. Vienna, Amsterdam; Leipzig, Leo.
- KERCHOVE, A. DE, Une Amie de Benjamin Constant: Belle de Charrière. Paris, NRC. 16 fr. 50.
- LACHÈVRE, F., M. Antoine Adam et Théophile, auteur de Francion? Paris, Margraff. 6 fr.
- MALHERBE, Poésies, II, ed. J. Lavaud (STFM). Paris, Droz. 25 fr.

- MALLARMÉ, Thèmes anglais pour toutes les grammaires: un inédit de Mallarmé. Paris, NRF. 21 fr.
- MARAÑÓN, G., Amiel: une étude sur la timidité. Paris, NRF. 35 fr.
- MARSAN, J., Autour du Romantisme. Paris, L'Archer. 50 fr.
- MAURRAS, CH., Jacques Bainville et Paul Bourget. Paris, Cadran. 80 fr.
- MOREAU, P., Les Destinées d'Alfred de Vigny (Les Grands Événements Littéraires). Paris. 12 fr.
- PASCAL, Pensées—Écrits sur la Grâce. Paris, NRF. 18 fr.
- PELLEGRINI, A., André Gide. Florence, La Nuova Italia. L. 10.
- PETIT, H., Descartes et Pascal. Paris, Rieder. 15 fr.
- POSADOWSKY-WEHNER, K. GRAF VON, Jean Parmentier (1494-1529) (Munchner rom. Arb. 7). München, Hueber. 4 M. 80.
- RACAN, Les Bergeries, II, ed. L. Arnould (STFM). Paris, Droz. 40 fr.
- REESE, H., La Mesnardière's Poétique (1639). Paris, Belles Lettres. 30 fr.
- RENARD, J., Journal. Paris, NRF. 40 fr.
- RIOTOR, L., Jacques Cartier et le Voyage au Canada. Paris, Roger. 15 fr.
- RONSARD, Opuscules de 1558-59 (Œuvres Complètes, IX), ed. P. Laumonier (STFM). Paris, Droz. 30 fr.
- ROUSSEAU, La Profession de foi du vicaire savoyard, ed. G. Beaulavon. Paris. 12 fr.
- ROUSSEL, E., Les Nuées maurassiennes. Paris, Flory. 15 fr.
- RYLAND, H., The Sources of the Play Cyrano de Bergerac. New York, Inst. of Fr. Stud. \$1.75.
- TANQUERAY, F. J., Le Jansénisme et les tragédies de Racine (Extr. de la RCC). Paris, Boivin.
- TREVES, P., Biografia di un poeta: Maurice de Guérin. Turin, Einaudi. L. 9.
- VIGNY, Stello, ed. M. Revon (Classiques Garnier). Paris, Garnier. 9 fr.

(d) *Provençal*.

- ARNAUT CATALAN, Poésie, ed. F. Blasi (Bibl. dell'AR). Florence, Olschki. 10s. 6d.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Scandinavian.

- Codex Regius der alteren Edda. Einleitung von Andreas Heusler. Kopenhagen, Levin og Munksgaard. 125 Kr.
- Edda. Die Lieder des Codex Regius nebst verwandten Denkmälern. Hrsg. von G. Neckel 2, 2. Aufl. (Germanische Bibliothek, Abt. 2, Bd. 9, 2.) Heidelberg, Winter. 6 M. 90.
- GEHL, W., Ruhm und Ehre bei den Nordgermanen. Studien zum Lebensgefühl der islandischen Saga. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Deutsche Philologie, Bd. 3.) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 7 M. 50.
- Gulathing, The Old Norwegian General Law of the, ed. by G. T. Flom. Urbana, Univ. of Illinois. \$3.00.
- SOMMER, R., Thule und die Heimat der Edda. Island und seine Probleme. Eine hygienische Studie über den Einfluss der Umwelt. (Veröffentlichungen aus dem Gebiet des Volksgesundheitsdienstes, Bd. 48, H. 2.) Berlin, Schoetz. 8 M. 60.
- VOGT, W. H., Altnorwegens Urfehdebann und der Geleitschwur (Tryggðamál und Griðamál). Weimar, Böhlau. 11 M. 20.

English.*(a) General (including Linguistic).*

- BUSH, D., *Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s.
- CAUDWELL, C. *Illusion and Reality. A Study of the Sources of Poetry*. London, Macmillan. 18s.
- DAVIES, G., *Charles Harding Firth*. London, H. Milford (for the British Academy). 1s. 6d.
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, Vol. xxii, collected by H. Darbishire. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- GROOM, B., *The Formation and Use of Compound Epithets in English Poetry from 1579 (S.P.E. Tract XLIX)*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, Vol. xix, ed. by J. A. Walz, B. J. Whiting, L. F. Solano. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 10s. 6d.
- HENDREN, J. W., *A Study of Ballad Rhythm*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.
- Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages*, No. 5. Leeds, School of English Language. 5s.
- PARTRIDGE, E., *A Covey of Partridge*. London, Routledge. 8s. 6d.
- PRAZ, M., *Storia della Letteratura Inglese*. Florence, Sansoni. 35 L.
- ROBERTS, M., *The Modern Mind*. London, Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.
- SCHIRMER, W. F., *Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. 1., 2., 3. Lief. Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. each.
- WIJK, A., *The Orthography and Pronunciation of Henry Machyn, the London Diarist*. Uppsala, Appelberg. 8 kr.
- Year's Work in English Studies*, The, Vol. xvi, ed. by F. S. Boas and M. S. Serjeantson. London, H. Milford (for the English Association). 10s. 6d.

(b) Old and Middle English.

- Maldon, *The Battle of*, ed. by E. V. Gordon. London, Methuen. 2s. 6d.
- MERSAND, J., *Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary*. Brooklyn, Comet Press. \$2.50.
- MÖLLNER, H., *Konjunktionen und Modus im Temporalsatz des Altenglischen (Spr. und Kult. der germ. und röm. Völker, A xxiv)*. Breslau, Priebatsch. 6 M.
- ROSENTHAL, C. L., *The 'Vitae Patrum' in Old and Middle English Literature*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
- ROSS, A. S. C., *Studies in the Accidence of the Lindisfarne Gospels*. Leeds, School of English Language. 10s.
- TOLKIEN, J. R. R., *Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics (Sir I. Gollancz Memorial Lecture, 1936)*. London, H. Milford (for the British Academy). 3s.
- Valentine and Orson*, translated by H. Watson, ed. by A. Dickson (E.E.T.S. 204). London, H. Milford. 20s.
- WARDALE, E. E., *An Introduction to Middle English*. London, Kegan Paul. 7s. 6d.

(c) Modern English.

- AUSTEN-LEIGH, E., *Jane Austen and Steventon*. London, Spottiswoode, Ballantyne. 1s.
- BAKER, E. A., *The History of the English Novel*, Vol. viii: *From the Brontes to Meredith*. London, Witherby. 16s.

- BOYLE, R., *EARL of ORRERY*, Dramatic Works, ed. by W. S. Clark, II. In two vols. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 42s.
- BROWN, C. A., *Life of John Keats*, ed. by D. H. Bodwitha and W. B. Pope. London and New York, Oxford Univ. Press. 6s.
- CAMMAERTS, E., *The Laughing Prophet. The Seven Virtues* and G. K. Chesterton. London, Methuen. 8s. 6d.
- CASTELLI, A., *Thomas Hardy Poeta* Milan, Vita e Pensiero. 8 L.
- CLYMER, W. B. and GREEN, C. R., *Robert Frost: A Bibliography*. Amherst, Mass., Jones Library. \$3.25.
- COFFIN, C. M., *John Donne and the New Philosophy*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s. 6d.
- DE LA BÈRE, R., *John Heywood, Entertainer*. London, Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.
- DELAFIELD, E. M., *Ladies and Gentlemen in Victorian Fiction*. London, Hogarth Press. 10s. 6d.
- DICKENS, *The Nonesuch*, ed. by A. Waugh, H. Walpole, W. Dexter and T. Hatton. In 23 vols. Vol. I, *The Pickwick Papers*. London, Nonesuch Press. 48 guineas the set.
- DUGGAN, G. C., *The Stage Irishman*. London, Longmans. 15s.
- FAIRCHILD, A. H. R., *Shakespeare and the Arts of Design*. Columbia, Univ. of Missouri. \$1.25.
- FIELD, I., *This Life I've Loved*. [R. L. Stevenson.] London, Michael Joseph. 15s.
- FRAUCHIGER, S., *Der englische Modernismus in seinen neuzeitlichen Auswirkungen nach den Werken von Dean Inge* (Swiss Stud. in Engl., v). Zürich und Leipzig, M. Niehans. 3 M.; 5 Sw. Fr.
- GILBERTSON, C., *Harriet Beecher Stowe*. New York, Appleton. 10s. 6d.
- GOLD, M. B., *Swift's Marriage to Stella*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 10s. 6d.
- HALL, J., *The Discovery of a New World*, englished by J. Healey, ed. by H. Brown. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s. 6d.
- HOARE, D. M., *The Works of Morris and of Yeats in Relation to Early Saga Literature*. Cambridge Univ. Press. 6s.
- HOWARTH, R. G., *Shakespeare's 'Tempest'*. Sydney, Engl. Association.
- JONSON, BEN, ed. by C. H. Herford and P. Simpson. Vol. v. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21s.
- KNIGHT, G. W., *The Wheel of Fire* (Oxford Bookshelf). London, H. Milford. 6s.
- KNIGHTS, L. C., *Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson*. London, Chatto and Windus. 12s. 6d.
- LOGAN, J. V., *The Poetry and Æsthetics of Erasmus Darwin*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s.
- MACCARTHY, D., *Leslie Stephen* (Leslie Stephen Lecture). Cambridge Univ. Press. 2s.
- MACKAY, M. E., *Meredith et la France* (Études de litt. étr. et comp. III). Paris, Boivin. 45 fr.
- Marlay Letters*, The, ed. by R. Warwick Bond. London, Constable. 21s.
- MASTERS, E. L., *Whitman*. London, Scribners. 12s. 6d.
- MILLS, L. J., *One Soul in Bodies Twain: Friendship in Tudor Literature and Stuart Drama*. London, Williams and Norgate. 16s.
- MILTON, J., *Paradise Lost*, prepared for Press by J. Isaacs. Golden Cockerel Press. 100 guineas and 10 guineas.
- MORLEY, T., *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke*, ed. by E. H. Fellowes (Shakespeare Assoc. Facsimiles, xiv). London: H. Milford. 21s.

- MOWAT, R. B., *The Romantic Age. Europe in the Early Nineteenth Century.* London, Harrap. 6s.
- NEWMAN, B., *Jonathan Swift.* London, Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.
- NICOLL, A., *The Development of the Theatre.* (New ed., rev.) London, Harrap. 36s.
- ODELL, G. C. D., *Annals of the New York Stage.* Vol. VIII, 1865-1870. Vol. IX, 1870-1875. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 45s. each.
- RICE, H. C., *Rudyard Kipling in New England.* Brattleboro, Vermont, Stephen Daye Press. \$1.50.
- SCHELLING, F. E., *Shakespeare Biography and Other Papers Chiefly Elizabethan.* Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 7s.
- SCOTT, Sir W., *Letters,* ed. by Sir H. Grierson. Vol. XII, 1831-1832. London, Constable. 18s.
- SCUDDER, T., *The Lonely Wayfaring Man. Emerson and some Englishmen.* Oxford Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Titus Andronicus: The First Quarto, 1594.* Facsimile Reproduction, ed. by J. Q. Adams. New York and London, Scribners.
- SHOEMAKER, E. C., *Noah Webster: Pioneer of Learning.* Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.
- SUTHERLAND, JAMES R., *Defoe.* London, Methuen. 12s. 6d.
- THORP, M. F., *Charles Kingsley, 1819-1875.* Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 14s.
- UTTER, R. P. and NEEDHAM, G. B., *Pamela's Daughters.* London, Lovat Dickson. 15s.
- WARFEL, H., *Noah Webster: Schoolmaster to America.* New York, Macmillan. 18s.
- WHITE, G., *The Natural History of Selborne.* Oxford Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- WHITLEY, W. T., *The English Bible under the Tudor Sovereigns.* London, Marshall, Morgan and Scott. 2s. 6d.

German.

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- Archiv für die gesamte Phonetik. Organ des deutschen Spracharchivs und der Gesell. f. Phonetik. Abteilung 1, Archiv für vergleichende Phonetik. Hrsg. D. Westermann. Bd. 1 (4 Hefte) H. 1, Jan. Berlin, Metten. Der Band 20 M.
- BEHREND, F., *Deutsche Studien,* 2. Berlin, Wendt. 2 M. 50.
- BOEGEHOLD, F., *Die Ortsnamen auf -ingerode (Thüringische Forschungen, H. 2).* Weimar, Böhlau.
- BUES, M., *Die Versportung der deutschen Sprache im 20. Jahrhundert (Deutsches Werden, H. 10).* Greifswald, Bamberg. 3 M.
- CHERBULIEZ, A.-E., *Das Volkslied in Graubünden.* Chur, Bischofberger. 1 Fr. 80.
- CORNIOLEY, H., *Über den sprachlichen Vergleich. Mit Beispielen aus Gotthelfs 'Kurt von Koppigen'.* Bern, Lang. 1 Fr.
- DAUS, K., *Jacques Rivière, seine Geistesart und Beurteilung des deutschen Wesens.* Würzburg, Tritsch. 3 M.
- Deutschtums in Slawonien und Syrmien, Beiträge zur Kunde des.* Hrsg. von H. Rudiger. Stuttgart, Weinbrenner. 1 M. 50.
- DIETZ, M., *Der Wortschatz der neueren Leibesübungen.* Heidelberg, Meister.
- GASSNER, H., *Bibliographie des Volksliedes im nordöstlichen Altbayern.* Kallmünz, Lassleben. 1 M. 30.

- Gesamtkatalog, Deutscher. Hrsg. von der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek. Berlin, Preussische Druckerei- und Verlags-A. G. 85 M.
- GRONBECH, W., Kultur und Religion der Germanen. Hrsg. von O. Hofier. Hamburg, Hanseatische Verlags-Anstalt. 11 M.
- GROSSHANS, K., Romain Rolland und der germanische Geist. Würzburg, Tritsch. 4 M.
- GUGGENBUHL, A., Warum nicht Schweizerdeutsch? Gegen die Missachtung unserer Muttersprache. Zürich, Guggenbühl und Huber. 1 Fr. 50.
- HILDEBRANDT, H., Die Altdeutschen Zahlverbindungen. Grafenhainichen, Heine.
- HOF, W., Der Gedanke der deutschen Sendung in der deutschen Literatur (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 50). Giessen, von Munchow. 7 M.
- JAFFÉ, G., Geschichte der Runenforschung. Geistesgeschichtliche Auffassung im 16.-18. Jahrhundert. Berlin, Behr's Verlag. 4 M. 50
- Jahrbuch der volkskundlichen Forschungsstelle am Herderinstitut zu Riga, Bd. 6. 2 M. 40.
- KURSTEN, O., Bunte Heimatflur der Thüringer Mundarten. Proben aus allen Teilen des Thüringer Sprachgebietes. Langensalza, Beltz. 2 M.
- KUTSCHER, A., Stilkunde des Theaters (Kutscher: Grundriss der Theaterwissenschaft, T. 2). Düsseldorf, Pflugschar-Verlag. 7 M. 50.
- MACKENSEN, L., Volkskunde in der Entscheidung. Versuch einer Standortbestimmung. (Philosophie und Geschichte, 63.) Tübingen, Mohr. 1 M. 50.
- MAMMEN, F. VON, Der Hund nach Wort und Spruch des Volkes (Bibliothek für Volks- und Weltwirtschaft, H. 83). Dresden, Pierson. 5 M.
- MARCHER, K., Deutsch 'von heute'. Bemerkungen zum Sprachverfall. Linz, Feichtinger. 1 S.
- MARKWARDT, B., Geschichte der deutschen Poetik (Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, Bd. 13/1). Berlin, de Gruyter. 14 M.
- MARZELL, H., Wörterbuch der deutschen Pflanzennamen. Leipzig, Hirzel. 5 M.
- MENTZ, F., Deutsche Ortsnamenkunde (Deutschkundliche Bücherei). Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 0 M. 75.
- MERSMANN, H., Volkslied und Gegenwart. Potsdam, Voggenreiter. 2 M. 50.
- NATAU, O., Mundart und Siedelung im nordöstlichen Preussen. Königsberg, Ost-Europa-Verlag.
- OLBERT, F., Tiroler Zeitungsgeschichte, I. Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Buchdruckerei und Verlagsanstalt. 2 M. 80.
- PAULSEN, P., Der Wikingerfund von Leckus und seine Bedeutung für die nordwesteuropäische Frühgeschichtsforschung (Beiträge zur Heimatforschung, H. 1). 2 M. 50.
- PRIEBATSCH, H., Die Josephsgeschichte in der Weltliteratur. Eine legendengeschichtliche Studie. Breslau, Maruschke und Berendt. 7 M. 20.
- RAFFELSBERGER, O., Glossen zur Fremdwörterverdeutschung. Leipzig, Saturn-Verlag. 0 M. 75.
- RHODE, H., Gotisch. Ein (Schrift-) Lehrgang. Berlin, Heintze und Blanckertz. 0 M. 15.
- SCHOLZ, W., Der klingende Sinn (Brückenbücherei, 14). Breslau, Heydebrand Verlag. 1 M. 20.
- SEIBERT, L., Die Seligenstädter Flurnamen. Seligenstadt in Hessen, Sprey. 0 M. 75.
- STIVEN, A., Englands Einfluss auf den deutschen Wortschatz. Zeulenroda, Sporn.
- STROH, F., Zur Deutung der hessischen Flurnamen. Giessen, von Münchow. 1 M.

- VANDVIK, E., Rhythmus und Metrum, Akzent und Iktus (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. suppl. 8). Oslo, Brøgger. 12 Kr.
- Verbotenen Bucher und Zeitschriften nach dem Stand vom 27. Feb., 1937, Verzeichnis der. Hrsg. von E. Schenk. Prag, Brunn, Pollak und Sohn. 15 Kš.
- VETTER, W., Die persönlichen Furwörter im Thuringischen Sprachraum (Thüringische Forschungen, H. 2). Weimar, Bohlau.
- VOGTHER, K., Die Geschichte des Worts 'deutsch' von Luther bis zur Aufklärung. Weimar, Bohlau. (Teildruck.)
- Volkskundliche Bibliographie. Im Auftrag des Verbandes Deutscher Vereine für Volkskunde mit Unterstützung von E. Hoffmann-Krayer hrsg. von P. Geiger. Berlin, de Gruyter. 33 M.
- VRIES, J. DE, Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte. Band 2. (Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, 12/2.) Leipzig, de Gruyter. 12 M.
- ZWIERNER, E., Textliste neuhochdeutscher Vorlesesprache schlesischer Farbung (Phonometrische Forschungen, Reihe B, Bd. 1). Berlin, Metten. 8 M. (Dazu gehörige Schallplatte 4 M.)

(b) *Old Saxon and Low German.*

- ALLWORDEN, W. VON, Professor Dr Conrad Borchling zum 65. Geburtstage. H. Teske: Die niederdeutsche Dichtung, R. Petsch: Hochdeutsche Dichter der Niederelbe. (Das niederdeutsche Hamburg, 6.) Hamburg, Boysen. 0 M. 60.
- Bruno Merseburgensis: Buch vom Sachsenkriege. Neu bearb. von H.-E. Lohmann. (Deutsches Mittelalter, Bd. 2.) Leipzig, Hiersemann. 4 M.
- Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch. Jahrgang 62. Hamburg, Hamburger Verlags-Anstalt. 6 M.
- SCHMIDT, K., Die Christianisierung der Sachsen. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 M.

(c) *Old and Middle High German.*

- ARBMAN, H., Schweden und das karolingische Reich. Studien zu den Handelsverbindungen des 9. Jahrhunderts. Stockholm, Bokförlags Aktiebolaget Thule. 15 Kr.
- BIELFELDT, E., Der Rheinische Bund von 1254. Ein erster Versuch einer Reichsreform. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Mittelalterliche Geschichte, Bd. 3.) Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 4 M. 50.
- BOESCH, B., Die Kunstanschauung in der mhd. Dichtung von der Blütezeit bis zum Meistergesang. Bern, Haupt.
- Chronik der Stadt Jena, Die älteste. Hrsg. von H. Koch. Jena, Vopelius. 1 M. 80.
- DENIFLE, H., Das geistliche Leben. Deutsche Mystiker des 14. Jahrhunderts. (Neubearbeitet nach der 1. Aufl. 1873.) Hrsg. . . von P. A. Auer. Salzburg, Pustet. 4 M. 70.
- GLOGNER, G., Der mittelhochdeutsche Lucidarius, eine Mittelalterliche Summa (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, H. 8). Münster, Aschendorff. 2 M. 80.
- GOERN, H., Das Ehebild im deutschen Mittelalter. Halle, Akademischer Verlag. 5 M. 60.
- HILDEBRAND, E., Über die Stellung des Liedes vom Herzog Ernst in der mittelalterlichen Literaturgeschichte und Volkskunde (Volk, Erg. Reihe, Bd. 2). Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 40.
- LABHARDT, A., Contributions à la critique et à l'explication des gloses de Reichenau. Borna-Leipzig, Noske.

- LECHNER, J., Die spatmittelalterliche Handschriftengeschichte der Benediktinerabtei St Walburg, Eichstatt (Eichstätter Studien, 2). Munster, Aschendorff. 5 M. 25.
- MERSCHBERGER, G., Die Rechtstellung der germanischen Frau (Mannus-Bucherei, Bd. 57). Leipzig, Barth. 12 M. 60.
- RONGE, H., Die Germania des Tacitus und die wichtigsten antiken Schriftsteller über Deutschland. Lateinisch und deutsch hrsg. Munchen, Heimeran. 2 M. 80.
- SCHEUNEMANN, E., Artushof und Abenteuer. Zeichnung hofischen Daseins in Hartmanns Erec. (Deutschkundliche Arbeiten, A, Bd. 8.) 4 M. 50.
- STECHE, T., Altgermanien im Erdkundenbuch des Claudius Ptolemaus. Leipzig, Kabitzsch. 9 M. 60.
- WAHMANN, P., Gnade Der ahd. Wortschatz im Bereich der Gnade, Gunst und Liebe. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Deutsche Philologie, Bd. 4.) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 8 M.

(d) *Early New High German.*

- AHLÉN, T., Die Kölner Bibel-Fruhdrucke. Entstehungsgeschichte. (Lunder germanistische Forschungen, 5.) Lund, Berling. 10 Kr.
- BAER, L., Holzschnitte auf Buchumschlagen aus dem 15. und der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts (Einblattdrucke des 15. Jahrhunderts, Bd. 90). Strassburg, Heitz. 50 M.
- BANGE, W., Meister Eckeharts Lehre vom gottlichen und geschöpflichen Sem. Lumburg a. d. Lahn, Pallotiner-Verlag. 7 M.
- HÜBNER, A., Zur Überlieferung des 'Ackermanns aus Bohmen'. Berlin, de Gruyter. 1 M. 50.
- KLEMM, K., Das Paradoxon als Ausdrucksform der spekulativen Mystik Sebastian Francks. Leipzig, Spamer.
- LANG, A., Heinrich Totting von Oyta. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ersten deutschen Universität und zur Problemgeschichte der Spätscholastik. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters, Bd. 33, H. 4/5.) Munster, Aschendorff. 11 M. 80.
- SCHRODER, E., Aus den Anfängen des deutschen Buchtitels (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-Hist. Klasse, Fachgruppe 4, N.F., Bd. 2, Nr. 1). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 3 M.
- UHL, L., Alberus und die Musik. Eine volkskundliche Untersuchung. (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 47.) Giessen, von Munchow. 3 M. 20.
- WALTHER, H., Stilkritische Untersuchungen über Hugo von Monfort. Marburg, Bauer.
- WOLF, H., Studie über die Natur bei Hans Sachs. Philippsburg, Kruse.

(e) *Modern German.*

- ACKERMANN, E., Shakespeare deutsch. Eine Einführung in das Übersetzungswerk von Walter Josten. Hamburg, Hartung. 2 M. 50.
- BASKEN, R., Die Dichter des Göttinger Hains und die Bürgerlichkeit. Eine literarsoziologische Studie. (Schriften der Albertus-Universität, Geisteswissensch. Reihe, Bd. 6.) Königsberg, Ost-Europa-Verlag. 9 M.
- BAUMBECKER, G., Schillers Schönheitslehre. Heidelberg, Winter. 5 M.
- BECK, A., Die Aischylos-Übersetzung des Grafen Friedrich Leopold zu Stolberg. Beiträge zur Wirkungsgeschichte der antiken Tragödie in Deutschland. Grafenhainichen, Heine.
- Brachmann, Luise, und den Schiller-Körnerkreis, Erinnerungen an. Dresden Meinhold.

- BREITWEISER, E., Der volkscundliche Ertrag der Schriften von Hermann Lons (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 48). Giessen, von Munchow. 3 M. 75.
- BRUGGEMANN, F., Bankelgesang und Singspiel vor Goethe (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Aufklärung, Bd. 10). Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- BUSCH, W., Die Selbstbetrachtung und Selbstdeutung des jungen Schiller (Deutsche Studien zur Geistesgeschichte, H. 4). Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M. 60.
- CALMBERG, E., Weltbild und Auftrag des Dichters, von Nietzsche bis George. Würzburg, Mayr. 3 M.
- Claudius, Matthias. Ein Sermon an die Mädchen... aus dem Wandsbecker Boten 1783. (Geschrieben von Rudo Spemann.) Ebenhausen, Lange-wiesche-Brandt. 1 M.
- CREMER, H., Die Bildergeschichten Wilhelm Buschs. Dusseldorf, Nolte. 2 M. 80.
- CYSARZ, H., Hoch- und Spätbarock (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Barock: Barocklyrik, Bd. 2). Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- DANGERS, R., Wilhelm Busch, der Künstler (Kunstbuche des Volkes, 18). Berlin, Rembrandt-Verlag. 4 M. 80.
- DETJEN, H., Hermann Bossdorf als Dramatiker. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung des Dichters. Hamburg, Propper. 3 M.
- EBELING, H., Ernst Wiechert. Berlin, Grote. 2 M. 80.
- EBERHARD, P., Die politischen Anschauungen der christlich-deutschen Tischgesellschaft. Untersuchungen zum Nationalgefühl Achim von Arnims, Baron de la Motte-Fouqués, Heinrich von Kleists und Adam Müllers. (Erlanger Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur, 7.) Erlangen, Palm und Enke. 3 M. 50.
- ECKERT, G., Der Zeitungsroman von heute (Zeitung und Zeit, N.F., Reihe A, Bd. 1). Frankfurt a. M., Diesterweg. 1 M. 30.
- EICHHOLZ, G., Die Geschichte als theologisches Problem bei Lessing. Gotha, Schmidt und Thelow.
- EILERT, E., Angelus Silesius als Streittheologe seiner Zeit. Dresden, Dittert.
- ELEMA, J., Stil und poetischer Charakter bei Detlev von Liliencron. Amsterdam, Paris. 5 Fl. 90.
- ENGEL, K., Goethe in seinem Verhältnis zur französischen Sprache. Quaken-bruck, Kleinert.
- Ernst, Paul, Der junge, 1866-1886 (Sammlung zur Lebensgeschichte Paul Ernsts, Bd. 1 = Jahrbuch der Paul-Ernst-Gesell.). 2 M. 50.
- ERRANTE, V., La personalità di Rilke (Bibliotheca Hertiana in Rom, Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für Kulturwissenschaft, Reihe 1, H. 4). Leipzig, Keller. 0 M. 80.
- FRICKE, G., Die Entdeckung des Volkes in der deutschen Geistesgeschichte vom Sturm und Drang bis zur Romantik (Kieler Universitätsreden, N.F., H. 8). Hamburg, Hanseatische Verlags-Anstalt. 1 M.
- GALLEY, H., Resignation und Entsagung in Adalbert Stifters Dichtung und Leben.
- HABICHT, R., Henri Bergson und das deutsche Typenlustspiel. Strassburg, Heitz.
- Harkort, Friedrich. Friedrich Harkort in seinen unbekannten Gedichten, in unveröffentlichten Briefen und Dokumenten. Hrsg. von P. Hilgenstock und W. Baumeister. Essen, Baumeister. 4 M. 20.
- HÄRTLE, H., Nietzsche und der Nationalsozialismus. München, Eher. 2 M. 80.
- HARTSEN, M., Die Natur im Leben und in den Werken der Annette Frein von Droste-Hülshoff. Leipzig, Teubner. 0 M. 75.
- Heeger, Viktor, ein treuer Schlesier (Werke, Auszüge). Zusammengestellt von H. Heeger. Jägerndorf, Druck- und Verlags-Anstalt 'Das Volk'. 24 Kk.

- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, Samtliche Werke. Jubiläums-Ausgabe in 20 Bänden. Auf Grund des von L. Boumann bes. Originaldruckes im Faksimile Verfahren neu hrsg. von H. Glockner. Bd. 1. Stuttgart, Frommann. 8 M.
- Holderlin, Friedrich, Briefe (Insel-Bucherei, Nr. 506). Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 0 M. 80.
- HOROVITZ, R., Vom Roman des jungen Deutschland zum Roman der Gartenlaube. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Liberalismus. M. und H. Marcus, Fernau/Leipzig. 6 M.
- JACOB, G., Shakespeares Naturverbundenheit im Vergleich mit Schillers und Goethes Verhältnis zur Natur. Gluckstadt, Augustin. 1 M. 80.
- JENAL, E., Wolfgang Menzel als Dichter, Literaturhistoriker und Kritiker (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte, Bd. 10). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 6 M. 80.
- JOLLES, C., Fontane und die Politik. Bernburg, Kunze. (Teildruck.)
- JUNGMAIR, O., Der oberösterreichische Heimatdichter Gregor Goldbacher. Linz, Bund o.-o. Mundartdichter.
- JUNGMAIR, O., Der oberösterreichische Heimatdichter Karl Mayer-Freinberg. Linz, Bund o.-ö. Mundartdichter.
- KAMPE, K., Hebbels Balladen. Hamburg, Evert. 3 M. 80.
- KARGER, G. von, Manfred Kyber, Dichter und Tierfreund. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker Verlag. 2 M. 50.
- KIMMICH, A., Kritische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Begriff 'Neuromantik' in der Literaturgeschichtsschreibung. Tübingen, Becht.
- KLEMMANN, E., Die Entwicklung des Schicksalsbegriffs in der deutschen Klassik und Romantik. Würzburg, Mayr.
- KURTE, K., Die deutschen Feld- und Schutzengrabenzeitungen des Weltkrieges. Leipzig, Universitäts-Verlag Noske.
- LACHMANN, E., Hölderlins Hymnen in freien Strophen. Eine metrische Untersuchung. Frankfurt a. M., Klostermann. 12 M. 50.
- LATZKE, R., Aus Roseggers Werkezeit. Wien, Österr. Bundes-Verlag. 4 M.
- LOHDE, W., Schiller und das Christentum. München, Ludendorffs Verlag. 0 M. 60.
- MAY, K., Deutsche Prosa im 18. Jahrhundert... vom Barock bis zur Klassik (Literarhistorische Bibliothek, Bd. 18). Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt. 3 M. 40.
- MAYER-FREINBERG, K., Gregor Goldbacher. Linz, Bund o.-o. Mundartdichter.
- MAYER-FREINBERG, K., Im Zeichen Franz Stelzhamers. Linz, Bund o.-ö. Mundartdichter.
- METTIN, H., Die Bedeutung des Staates in Schillers Leben, Weltanschauung und Dramen. Berlin, Langen/Müller.
- MOVIUS, R., Rainer Maria Rilkes Stunden-Buch. Entstehung und Gehalt. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 6 M.
- MÜLLER, A., Auf dem Weg zum Realismus (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Romantik, Bd. 19). Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- MÜLLER, C., Die geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen des Symbolbegriffs bei Winckelmann. Grafenhainichen, Heine. (Teildruck.)
- NEUWINGER, R., Die deutsche Mystik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des 'Cherubinischen Wandersmannes' Johann Schefflers (Schriften zur deutschen Geistes- und Bildungsgeschichte, H. 1). Bleicherode, Nieft. 6 M.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, Werke und Briefe. Hist.-krit. Gesamtausgabe. Hrsg. von der Stiftung Nietzsche-Archiv. Werke Bd. 4. München, Beck. 13 M. 50.
- RUNGE, P., Briefe und Gedichte (Kiepenhauer-Bucherei). Berlin, Kiepenhauer. 2 M. 50.

- SCHLOSSER, A., Die englische Literatur in Deutschland von 1895 bis 1934 (Forschungen zur englischen Philologie, 5). Jena, Frommann. 20 M.
- SCHMID, G., Goethe, Thüringer Laboranten und ein Faustsagenfragment. Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M. 70.
- SCHREINERT, K., Goethes letzte Wandlung. Tartu, Mattiesen. 12 S.
- SCHWABE, J., Friedrich Baron de la Motte Fouqué als Herausgeber literarischer Zeitschriften der Romantik (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, B, Bd. 20). Breslau, Priebsch's Buchhandlung. 4 M. 80.
- SCHWANTJE, M., Christian Wagner, der Dichter und Ethiker. Zürich, Verein gegen die Vivisektion. 0 Fr. 30.
- SECKEL, D., Hölderlins Sprachrhythmus. Weimar, Uschmann. (Teildruck.)
- SEUFFERT, B., Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe, 8. Berlin, de Gruyter. 10 M. 50.
- SIEGEL, H., 'Lieb' und Lust und Leben... Die Welt des Kindes in den Dichtungen Conrad Ferdinand Meyers. Basel, Geering. 6 Fr.
- SPLIKER, W., Robert Prutz als Zeitungswissenschaftler. Leipzig, Universitäts-Verlag.
- STIRK, S., Gerhart Hauptmanns 'Jesusstudien' in ihrer Beziehung zu dem Roman 'Der Narr in Christo Emanuel Quint'. Breslau, Maruschke und Berendt. 3 M.
- STOLDT, A., Friedrich Ludwig Jahns 'Deutsches Volkstum' von 1810. Hamburg, Evert. 4 M. 50.
- THOMAS, H., Weltauffassung und künstlerischer Ausdruck im dichterischen Werke Ina Seidels (Deutsche Studien zur Geistesgeschichte, H. 2). Würzburg, Triltsch. 2 M.
- TRÖGE, W., Goethe und der deutsche Wein. Eine Studie. Eisenach, Kthner.
- TRUNZ, E., Dichtung und Volkstum in den Niederlanden im 17. Jahrhundert (Schriften der deutschen Akademie, H. 27). München, Reinhardt. 2 M. 20.
- UNGER, R., Richtungen und Probleme neuerer Schiller-Deutung (Nachrichten der Gesell. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse, Fachgruppe 4, N.F. Bd. 1, 9). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 2 M.
- WAGNER, G., Holderlin und die Vorsokratiker. Würzburg, Triltsch. 4 M. 50.
- Wagner, Richard. König Ludwig II und Richard Wagner. Briefwechsel... in 4 Bänden hrsg. vom Wittelsbacher Ausgleichs-Fonds und Winifrid Wagner. Bearb. von O. Strobel. Karlsruhe, Braun. 64 M.
- WEBER, W., Das Geraer Theater vor 150 Jahren. Die Meddoxische 'Gesellschaft deutscher Schauspieler'.... Gera, Geraer Zeitung. 0 M. 50.
- WEICHBERGER, A., Der Wielandsplatz zu Weimar und seine Geschichte. Weimar, Fink. 1 M. 20.
- WIECHERT, E., Von den treuen Begleitern. Über vier Gedichte von Claudius, Goethe, Holderlin und Mörike. (Das Gedicht, Jahrg. 1937.) Hamburg, Verlag Blätter für die Dichtung. 0 M. 40.
- Wiegand, Carl Friedrich, Dem Dichter, zu seinem 60. Geburtstage... Stuttgart, Strecker und Schröder.
- WILDHABER, A., Das Bild der Reformation in der jungdeutschen Epoche. Bern; Pochon-Jent.
- WILLIMSKY, H.-J., Johann Gottfried Seume als Reiseschriftsteller. Greifswald, Adler.
- ZIMMERMANN, A., Die schweizerische Demokratie in den Werken Jeremias Gotthelfs und Gottfried Kellers. Basel, Helbing und Lichtenhahn. 1 M. 50.